SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, Editor.

Without Concealment....Without Compromise.

EDMUND QUINCY,
JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, } CORRESPONDING EDITORS.

VOL. XI....NO. 25. NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 14, 1850. WHOLE NO. 545.

Published Weekly,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
AT 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK.

Terms:

TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to S. H. GAY, New York.

Donations to the Treasury of the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY may be addressed to ELIZUR WRIGHT, Jr. Boston; or S. H. GAY, New York.

Norris & Brother, Printers.

Pro-Slavery.

LETTER FROM THE HON. SAMUEL A. ELIOT.

We take pleasure in laying before our readers the following communication from the Hon. Samuel A. Eliot, explanatory of his views on the subject of the fugitive slave bill, which he voted his vote on the passage in the House of Representatives, in concurrence with the Senate, in which body it originated. We trust his constituents and the public will do him the justice of giving it a careful perusal. They will perceive that he has not acted on this subject, as he is incapable of doing on any, thoughtlessly, or on any reason satisfactory to himself, his own mind, and such as are deserving of careful consideration. Those who may not agree with him in his conclusions will at least give him credit for honesty, or good principle, according to his own sense of public duty.—*Daily (Boston) Advertiser.*

MR. HALE:—This peculiar circumstance of the sixth and of my own position, induce me to ask of you the use of the columns of the Advertiser for a brief explanation of the reasons of the course I have recently pursued. I do it in the hope, and indeed in entire confidence, that my fellow citizens know me well enough, and have known me long enough, to enable them to believe that I am honest and true to them, and that they will impute to me no sinister or ambitious motive for what may not have met with their approbation.

It is a rather striking circumstance attending the excitement of the present moment, that among the several subjects of inquiry which have been brought to the attention of the great community of the north, the one which has roused all their fire and excited so much sympathy and indignation, is precisely the only one in regard to which there existed any constitutional obligation. All the other questions were to be adjusted according to our ideas of propriety or expediency; but this upon the sense of duty alone. The feelings are, at all times, very bad guides for political action; and in this case it seemed to me to be imperative upon every one claiming to act on principle, and with due reverence for the constitution, to set aside every impulse of mere feeling, and to consider especially his obligation to the government under which he lives.

In order to have a clear and just sense of the nature and weight of these obligations, I deem it necessary to advert a little to the history of the period when there was no constitution of the United States; to inquire what was the condition of things at that time, what were the reasons for forming the constitution, and the terms upon which alone it could be adopted. It is well known that it was only by the north at the north and the south, previous to the adoption of the constitution, was one of unequaled depression and misery. The period of the war of the revolution itself was a less disastrous time; for war gave us the exclusive possession of the home market, at least, and our productions were supported and our commerce protected. But with peace came the introduction of foreign commodities, at such rates of duty as each rival State chose to fix—generally the lowest possible, on the free principle; and as we had little else than corn, wheat and tobacco to pay with, we were compelled to glut our own markets with a very inferior quality of goods, and thus depress our prices for selling, as well as those for buying. People were impoverished, dishearted, miserable, to such a degree that at the close of the confederation, between the close of the war and the adoption of the constitution, are universally spoken of by historians, and were always described by the men of the United States themselves, as the period of their greatest depression and misery. Everybody saw and acknowledged the difficulties in the way of such an experiment. It was a complicated arrangement, embracing almost innumerable particulars. But all might be arranged pretty well except one. Slavery had been abolished in some of the States, and still existed in others. Here seemed an insurmountable incompatibility of interests; and nothing prophesied the wise men of that day—and they were very wise men—so much as this topic. At last they agreed that the new constitution should have nothing to do with it, that the word Slavery should not be mentioned in it, and that it should be left to the management and control of the States themselves, to establish, retain, or abolish it, just as most suited their interests. They did the constitution as before. But in order to secure the existence of the institution to those States who preferred it, it was agreed that they should be entitled to a portion, which they were bound in one commonwealth, and found in another, should be returned to the State from which they had fled. The provision was necessary for the preservation of this interest in *status quo* but it did not *extend* Slavery. It kept it where it already was, and where it could not have continued long, if slave and free could not have mingled at once, to be free and irreclaimable. The members of the confederacy from the south saw this distinctly, and deliberately declared that they could not, and would not, enter into a Union with States who would tempt away their slaves with the prospect of immediate and permanent freedom.

The provision of the constitution for restoring fugitive slaves was a conservative measure only. It simply did not extend the extent of Slavery; it rather it did not abolish it. for such would have been the speedy result, if the United States had guaranteed the freedom of every runaway slave.

The question, then, for our predecessors to decide was, whether it was right and expedient to form a union with slaveholders, and promise them not to interfere with their slaveholding. They decided that it was, as I think we should have done, if we had been in their places. They decided that they could not and ought not to form a union, which oppressed them on every side, the subjection to the foreign merchant, the slavery of themselves and their children to the European manufacturer and trader.

The constitution was adopted with this provision; and it could not have been adopted without it. The States that had won their power to make constitutions for themselves, by cooperating through eight long years of exhausting war, and who had shed their second as a matter of course, the establishment, which could be created by nothing short of such common toils and sacrifices, would never, without that provision, have joined in the political union, and never have set the example of the successful experiment of republican government for sixty years of unparalleled growth and prosperity; and would never have left to us the inestimable inheritance of a wisely contrived and balanced government, to which we have been indebted for so many privileges and advantages unknown to the rest of the world, and the prospect of greater and greater success with all advancing time, if we will only maintain it in its original principles.

Not only did our fathers bequeath us this glorious constitution, but the precious inheritance of their fame, their wisdom, their valor, their patriotism, and especially that spotless reputation of their great leader, "the first in the hearts of his countrymen." I shall not attempt a eulogy on that reversed name. It is not necessary. Not a true heart beats in America that does not cherish his renown as a large part of the national glory, or that does not love, as well as honor, the name of Washington. But there have, of late years, sprung up parties who have so far misunderstood, or forgotten, or disregarded the compact of their fathers, as to introduce into the discussion of political subjects, in the government of the United States, the very topic which was excluded from the constitution, because it was to relinquish to the government setting under it can have no power: and who, assuming a responsibility for the continued existence of Slavery in which the framers of the constitution expressly abjured for that government, have felt themselves called upon to discuss the subject in very excited manner, and to inform us that they have forgotten (or disregarded) the last injunctions and entreaties of the Father of his country. They have formed a political party; and by means of violent language, and sometimes by acts of violence, they have inflamed the slaveholding States in the very manner which was foreseen and forbidden by the wisdom and patriotism of Washington. They repudiate for themselves all interest in the glory of the conquest, and its framers. Washington included, and they throw the responsibility on them, it seems to me the very reverse of what distinguished our revolutionary fathers. I observe an intemperate tone, which does not seem to accompany wisdom, n professed disregard of *all* consequences which is not commonly recognized as the offspring of patriotism, or of good principle. With such parties I cannot act. I believe in the wisdom of the provisions of the constitution. I believe in a power of conciliation and healing by forbearance in political ends, not otherwise to be obtained, with those who think themselves justified in holding back. I can not when I see the spirit of some of the glories of the revolutionary south, any more than of the revolutionary north. I cannot cease to love and honor the fathers of the revolution, and the fathers of the constitution. If the battles of the council chamber or the field were to be fought over again, when they did not be as ready to unite as one south, slaveholding as it is, as we are John Adams, of Massachusetts, or John Jay, of New York; as ready as Joseph Warren and William Prescott, of Bunker Hill, or Nathaniel Greene, of Eutaw.

I may be allowed to say that I have acted on this principle. In the last session of Congress the struggle for the compromise measures, and indignation, which I have been settled, so far as Congress is concerned, on precisely the same principles as those on which it is well first enacted. I consider all the conditions of the compromise as a re-enactment of the constitution; and may it remain hereafter unassailed.

The attempt has been made, for successive years, to induce the government of the United States to take an active part on the subject of Slavery. This has been resisted, and justly resisted, by the government of the United States is bound not to do any such thing. Action on that subject is forbidden to it. It is left exclusively to the people of the several States; and there is precisely where it is left by the recent compromise. We still say to the south, as the constitution says: we will not take your property from you, by guaranteeing freedom to every one of them who crosses Mason & Dixon's line, or Ohio river. You may seize them back again, by the agency of the U. S. officers, since some of the States have prohibited their officers from acting in such cases. We disapprove of the institution—we wish it did not exist—we pray for an union; but if you think differently, we will not disturb you in your possession of slaves; we have no right to control your consciences and your wills.

This is one part of the meaning of the entire series of measures which constituted the conciliatory policy of the two Houses of Congress of which I speak during the last session—a policy adopted under the guidance of prominent men of both the principal parties, and intended to heal the wounds of a severe strife, settle power, and attachment to the constitution, have placed his fame on the same level with that of the heroic age of Greece, and assigned him a place in rank with the most patriotic of revolutionary times. It is the only policy on this subject upon which I can act, or in which I can put any confidence, or hope for stability. I believe it to be best for the captive, as well as for the freeman, that the constitution of the United States should be maintained. Whatever may be my sympathy with the slave, and it certainly is not small, I have no right to set him free. I am not responsible in the matter. I have no power, directly or indirectly, to do it. It is another who does this; and while I differ from that other in opinion as to the justice and expediency of his conduct in this, I have no right to say that he *shall not* hold a slave, if it comports with his judgment of the right and expedient to do so. I may say to him, to by sure, that I will not meddle with him, for any purpose, so long as he holds a slave; but I have yet to learn the wisdom, or the peculiar merit, of such a course.

Having thus adverted to the general policy upon which the fugitive slave bill rests, I will state, in a few words, my view of the character of the bill, as its probable effect upon the condition of the fugitive. It may seem strange to those who have heard nothing but bitter denunciations of the act, to hear it said that it is practically more favorable to the fugitive than the law of 1793. The evidence of such an assertion may be found in the fact that, by the old law, every magistrate in the commonwealth, amounting to several hundreds, and so in the other States, was authorized and required to cause the arrest of any fugitive, examine him, and send back the fugitive to his master, if he was proved to be a slave; while under the new law that power is limited to the justices of the United States courts, and to the commissioners appointed by them, not exceeding, perhaps, on an average, six or eight persons in each State. There was no more trial by jury granted for under the old law than there is under the new. The claim of a jury trial is entirely new, never thought of till modern discussions of the subject began. For fifty-seven years our fathers had been living fifty-seven years and never had been put into any such claim which provided for no such thing; and under laws which provide no such provision is denounced now one which makes no such provision is denounced in unmeasured terms as contrary to the laws of God. Do we all been for half a century! Do not the denouncers perceive that they are denouncing their fathers and themselves! The entire population of the north has acquiesced in the provisions of the law of 1793, without thinking itself exposed to the charge of barbarity; and I have only to say that I do not think the charge any more just now. Desirable as it may be, that a trial by jury should be required in the State where the arrest is made, the absence of it in no way cannot be termed barbarous, or inhuman. Nor should it be overlooked that our southern brethren have sympathies with the contrary opinion, perhaps, on an average, six or eight persons in each State. There was no more trial by jury granted for under the old law than there is under the new. The claim of a jury trial is entirely new, never thought of till modern discussions of the subject began. For fifty-seven years our fathers had been living fifty-seven years and never had been put into any such claim which provided for no such thing; and under laws which provide no such provision is denounced now one which makes no such provision is denounced in unmeasured terms as contrary to the laws of God. Do we all been for half a century! Do not the denouncers perceive that they are denouncing their fathers and themselves! The entire population of the north has acquiesced in the provisions of the law of 1793, without thinking itself exposed to the charge of barbarity; and I have only to say that I do not think the charge any more just now. Desirable as it may be, that a trial by jury should be required in the State where the arrest is made, the absence of it in no way cannot be termed barbarous, or inhuman. Nor should it be overlooked that our southern brethren have sympathies with the contrary opinion, perhaps, on a large scale, and have been said by Mr. Clay, in a public manner, and I believe under the new law sort occurred in one of his speeches in the senate last spring, that he had assisted in many succeeded last spring, that he had assisted as counsel for the captive, but never when he had been engaged by the master; and that there was a general feeling in favor of the rights of the master. And why should we doubt it? Do we imagine the entire south to be inhabited by fiends? Have we forgotten the history of the south, and of our common origin with us, and has probably some of the same feelings of humanity with ourselves? Let us not dream that all virtue and all wisdom will die with us.

It is said the new law suspends the operation of the writ of habeas corpus. Legal authority of the writ of habeas corpus is held to be entire; and we all highest kind claimed being jurists, that no law can suspend the constitution.

It is said, too, that the new law is unreasonable, because it throws the responsibility of safe custody upon the marshal, at all events. "This may be a hardship upon the marshal, but does not effect the position of the fugitive particularly; and it resembles so nearly the liability of every sheriff for the custody of every prisoner, that no such broad distinction can exist as is sometimes asserted.

Again, the law makes it penal to assist in the rescue of the slave, after he has been proved to be such. Of course it must, and the penalty must be effective, or there would be the inconsistency of an act passed which should be a dead letter, which it is. The penalty should certainly be graduated by the nature of the offence, and I am disposed to believe that it is too severe, for the case of the rescuer. But it is manifest that the violent charges brought against the law, are in reality, brought against the principle of the provision of the constitution requiring the delivery of the fugitive from labor. The reasons for originally making that provision have been already stated; and it appears to me that they are as strong for continuing it in force, as they were for making it first. The Union cannot be preserved without it, any more than it could have been formed without it. The abolition of Slavery is not retarded by it. It is the discussion of the subject in non-slaveholding States which delays emancipation. This is a which it should be made, as well as it may. This it is which leads him to rivet the chain more firmly, and look to the links more carefully; and when we shall have ceased irritating him by rancorous language, he may then, but certainly not till then, begin to calculate coolly the advantages and disadvantages of his condition, and to perceive, without prejudice, the right and the wrong of the practice. Denunciation and violence have made the south, and will make any one else, we complain of the South; and it is especially to be deprecated by those who have an interest in the welfare of the south, and who would wish to feel as deeply as any of my friends and constituents. It must be recollected that emancipation, if it is to be accomplished, must come from the south, and it is are so often assailed with opprobrious language; and that the best influence the north can exert on the subject, is that of the kind of feeling and language, the sentiments and wishes of Massachusetts, as expressed by her legislature, and felt by her people, are in the highest degree honorable to the Commonwealth and to her people, with few exceptions, are consistent with the obligations she is under to the Union. But they can impose no duty which can abridge her constitutional rights, and the law which binds me to the fulfilment of the promises of the constitution, as of all other promises, is a part of the highest law which I recognize, and shall be obeyed, and enforced, I shall hold on to the Union, even with slaveholding States, with a tenacity which nothing but the sternest necessity will unloose, as the only political hope of the world.

I know there are those who say and think that there is no remedy for the violation, but we may talk, and write, and petition, and refuse to perform what have been esteemed our constitutional obligations on the subject of Slavery until we have reduced nobody will do anything but bluster in return; but as I think differently, I must shape my course differently. It is to me a matter of the very last importance, and therefore improper and dangerous. Those whose use it cannot advert to this irritating character, nor to the continued excitement which it must lead to, but the continued excitement is inevitably a state of danger to any community. It is now by duty of good citizens, and a humane, and wise, to do all in their power, everything that is practicable to calm the irritation that exists between the north and the south, and to reunite them in good will and in the ties of kindred, and not to transmit to posterity the inestimable blessings we have enjoyed from the Union, while we avoid the the worst and most immeasurable evil that must flow from division.

It will not be inferred, I trust from anything I have now said, that I consider the fugitive slave bill as perfect and unexceptionable. There are amendments which I strongly desire to see introduced into it, and for which I would have labored before the adoption of the compromise measures, had it been possible.—But every one knows that was impracticable, and the question was whether this bill ought to be adopted, or the whole compromise lost, or the design of the constitution more important than the objectionable details of the bill, and while I claim no authority for my own judgment, I trust I may be permitted to say that I have acted as I thought for the best. Perhaps I may also claim, without arrogance, to have exhibited heretofore, in substantial services, a genuine sympathy with the wronged and oppressed, and may hope that I shall not be considered as having altogether lost the disposition to aid them. Because I cannot show it by setting aside constitutional obligations, or pursuing a course which would lead to disunion and anarchy, and would be destructive to all I love, the slave and the free, the African and the European races.

Respectfully, &c.,
SAMUEL A. ELLIOT.

IMPORTANT LETTER ON THE FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW FROM JUDGE GRIER.

The following letter from Judge Grier, of the United States Supreme Court, on the constitutionality of the Fugitive Slave Law, will be read with interest:—

Philadelphia, October 25, 1850.

Dear Sir—My official engagements have hindered me from giving that prompt attention to the contents of your letter of the 22d instant which it would otherwise have received.

In the Garnett case, the warrant issued by that court was founded on the affidavit of the alleged owner of the fugitive. But on the trial or hearing, before the court, after the arrest, this affidavit was not received in evidence, nor did the counsel for the claimant insist upon it should be received. The claimant had wholly neglected to make the proper proof, before some court or judge in Maryland, to establish the fact, that he was entitled to the services, or person held to labor, and what was the name, age, size, and other marks of such person, and that the person so described had escaped from the claimant, and deprived of the privileges and facilities given him by the act of Congress for this purpose, we decided that he must be bound by the common rule of evidence, and as in other cases, where a title to property has to be established before a court. We refused to receive the parties in interest to testify in their wills, and other instruments of title, unless properly proved.

The act contemplates a trial and a decision of the court or judge involving questions of law and fact, and unless the action of the commission law is so closely followed, when not changed by statute, the tribunal would be without rule, governed only by caprice, or undefined discretion, which would be the exercise of a tyrannical not a judicial power. It is the duty of the judge who exercises it, to render equal justice both to the claimant and the fugitive. Neither can be heard on one side only, and that, too, without any regard to any rule or principle known to the law, gross opposition and wrong would flow from it. Freemen and citizens of Pennsylvania might be kidnapped into bondage, under the forms of law, and by the action of a legal tribunal, sworn to do equal and exact justice to all men. This much maligned law not only gives a "trial" before the legal tribunal, before the claimant can be authorized to carry the alleged fugitive out of the State, but it takes away from the prisoner no right which he would have enjoyed before this act of Congress was passed.

In all cases of extradition, the evidence of establishing the offence and escape of the person demanded, is usually made in the country from which the person demanded has escaped, and it is necessarily *ex-parte*, and the chief question to be decided by the tribunal before whom he is brought, is whether he is the person for his extradition, is only the question of identity. The party demanded has a right, of course, to show that he is not the person, or that he is a free man, or that he is not bound to her own citizens, or to persons who are charged with committing an offence within her borders. Pennsylvania has never claimed, that her State government to which the fugitive belongs, it is to be presumed, will do justice to its own subjects or citizens, and whether they do or not, it is no concern of ours. However individuals may fancy they have a mission to rectify all wrongs on the face of the earth, the State of Pennsylvania does not, and will not, sell bound to the Quixotic enterprise of avenging the oppression of serfs in Russia, or slaves in Georgia. This act of Congress has no other object than to judge should, without a trial surrender a citizen of Pennsylvania to kidnapper. The province, that, in no trial or hearing, authorizes the kidnapper to take any of such fugitive be admitted in evidence, is no more than the enactment of an established principle of the common law, that no man shall be a judge in his own cause. If this provision were not in the act, it would not receive the testimony of the prisoner to prove that he was the person claimed, and that he was free man. It would be a temptation to perjury which no tribunal should permit to be presented to any man. No lawyer would urge before the court such an absurd construction of the act of Congress, as that it means that no evidence shall be heard on the part of the alleged fugitive. If such were the intention of the legislature, it was easy to express it in unequivocal terms. In truth, there is nothing equivocal in the language of the act; it forbids the judge, or the commissioner, to hear the party, but the testimony of disinterested witnesses. It almost seems that nothing but a desire to render the law odious, for the sake of political agitation, could ever have led to so gross a misconstruction, and so gross a libel on our national legislature. It has been objected, also, to this law, that it suspends the *habeas corpus* act, that such as it enacts that the certificate of the judge or commissioner, 'shall be conclusive of the right of the person to whom from or to whom such fugitive, and shall prevent all molestation of such person or persons, by any process issued by any court, judge, magistrate or other person whomsoever.' But this is a mistake. The truth is, that this provision of the law forbidding the testimony of the fugitive to be received, and forbidding interference by other process, after a certificate, is but an enactment of an established principle of the common law, added through extreme caution, but wholly unnecessary. The writ of *habeas corpus* is undoubtedly an immediate remedy for every illegal imprisonment; but no imprisonment is illegal when the person is a justification of the officer; and process, whether by writ or warrant, is legal, whenever it is not defective in the frame or form, or issued by one not possessed of jurisdiction, or by one a magistrate having jurisdiction of the subject matter.'—(Commonwealth vs. Leahy, 1 Wallis, 87.)

A person held as a fugitive under the certificate of a judge or magistrate, under this act is legally imprisoned, under process 'from a court or magistrate having jurisdiction, and cannot be released by any other court or magistrate, on a writ of *habeas corpus or homine replegiando*. The act of 1793 has such provisions as are applicable to the subject of complaint in the present case; yet in the case of Wright vs. Deacon, (5 Sergt. and Rawle, 62,) the supreme court of Pennsylvania held that such a certificate under that act was a legal warrant to remove the fugitive to the State of Maryland, and no writ of *homine replegiando* issued by a State Court to try the question of freedom; and that a writ issued under such circumstances was in violation of the constitution of the United States.

The chief difference between the fugitive act of 1850 and that of 1793 is, that the former allows a party to be issued by the United States Court, to be made by a public officer, and imposes more stringent penalties on those who interfere, by violence, to prevent the execution of legal process. Those who believe that the constitution and laws of their country should be regarded and obeyed, have no ground of complaint; and those who do not, will continue to abuse both, as usual.

I am happy to say that my brother Kane fully concurs with me in the view I here express.

I am, very respectfully, yours, &c.,
R. C. GRIER.

To CHARLES GIBBONS, Esq.

Selections.

MR. MANN'S ANSWER.

TO THE FREE SOIL NOMINATION IN THE EIGHTH DISTRICT.

QUINCY, 21st October, 1850.

HON. HORACE MANN, Boston, Mass.: *Dear Sir*,—At the Convention held on the 16th instant, by the members of the Free Soil party in the Eighth Congressional District of Massachusetts, I was nominated for the office of Representative in the Congress of the United States. For the kind terms in which your communication is expressed, he pleased to accept my thanks.

This nomination places me in no new relation to the friends of Freedom and Humanity, wherever they may be found. I believe my name has been presented to the voters of this District, (now nearly three years ago,) on the ground of my supposed devotion to the Rights of Man. The nomination has constituted a tribunal with which I have been nominated, and especially those passed so repeatedly and unanimously by our State Legislature, have been in conformity to the wishes of the great majority of my constituents and of the State, as those wishes have been repeatedly expressed. This renders any detailed exposition of expectations on your part, or of assurances on mine unnecessary. I know that the leading and most valued article in your creed is the sacredness and security of Human Freedom. You know, that I embrace this same article of faith with my whole heart. Other matters may be very important, but still are subordinate. Peculiar forms of organization are comparatively non-essential. They are but means in ends; and, in regard to them, a large allowance is to be made for honest differences of opinion. The natural right of every human being to the liberty which God has given him, until forfeited by crime of his own; the duty of our government to use every power on earth over which it has jurisdiction from the direst of all earthly curses and the greatest of all social crimes—the curse and crime of Slavery—these are amongst the first of the dread accountabilities that attach to rational and immortal creatures.

I believe it also to be the duty of the government to encourage industry by securing the rewards of labor to the laborer, and to discourage the competitions in which those who rule and control the impoverished, degraded and almost brutified laborers of other countries are striving to enter. I believe that the government ought, if it not prevented, will, to a great extent, reduce our laborers to the wretchedness and privation of theirs. I believe that the government should protect the white with it, which seek competitions take from the workmen here, do not go to improve the condition of the world, but they are disorganizing and depopulated by others. I make this statement of my views all the more readily, because I do not wish to receive an support from any man, and I know I therefore abjure all disguises and reserves. From my past votes and speeches in Congress, my constituents have a pledge that principle and the ends I have acted. To them I refer, and deem it unnecessary to say more.

I should not, even the trouble to read what I have said on the floor of the House, must have seen that, though I have endeavored to express some stern truths, on vital subjects, in unsparing language, yet that I have never uttered a word designed to inflict unnecessary pain upon our political brethren of the South, or to wound feelings which I know to be sensitive and tender. I desire to pursue the same course at all times and with all men. The cause of liberty is one in which the true object is to convert, not to exasperate the most clear, and not to use harsh expressions respecting the conduct or opinion of others. It is unnecessary for me to say, that I was not prepared to vote for the compromise measures, and that I should be in a calm state of mind, as that I should be in such a state myself. Exasperation paralyzes judgment. The great points on which men and parties so vehemently differ, can only be permanently settled at the tribunal of reason.

Several laws were passed in the last session of Congress, on which I desired and designed to speak, in the name and on behalf of my constituents. But I was obliged to see them under the silence enforced by the Previous Question. One of them, in particular, was so hostile to all the principles which history and reason had ever taught me, and so wounding to all the sentiments which I had ever imbibed from benevolence and religion, that I resolved to seize the first opportunity that should be offered to portray some of its features. I refer to the Fugitive Slave Bill, so called; and I trust this will not be deemed an unfitting occasion for such a purpose. I mean, it will remark, that I had prepared an amendment for the security of our free colored seamen in Southern ports, but was not allowed to offer it, even in order. I do not mean that if new and oppressive measures were to be taken to carry back alleged slaves to bondage, something should not be attempted in behalf of liberty. While the South were seeking new guarantees for men who claim to own other men, it was a time for the friends of human rights and freedom to remember their own themselves. But all debate was suppressed; property vanquished liberty; and a pure and benevolent law was enacted, unadulterated by any alloy of freedom.

In regard to this Fugitive Slave Bill, is it not another State—or rather Federal—question? Does the Constitution *demand* the trial by jury, instead of the question: Will the Constitution *allow* such provisions as have been made, in consequence? Is more than he is compelled to give. The last is the republican question, volunteering all that he can grant. In a free government, the trial by jury is held to be the surest safeguard of personal liberty, the inquiry ought never to be, whether the Constitution *secures or necessitates* this form of trial, but whether it will consent to allow it, or *tolerate* it. Instead of seeking evasions, and close constructions, and hunting among the musty parchments of the Constitution, for a right to a jury trial in cases of personal liberty, the true lover of freedom would ask only for an interpretation that would secure it. It would not be among his wishes, though; he would not wait until a stern necessity forced such a construction upon him; but his first inquiry would be for some legitimate and honest reason for conferring it. He would not ask, in how few cases he must, but in how many he might, adhere to the old principle, which has prevailed, and still discussed, on one side, as though we were bound to avoid the jury trial it we could; not as though we were bound to seek it, if by fair interpretation we might. It has been discussed as though the jury trial, to protect a man's right to himself, were an evil; and as though the sudden seizure, without any judgment, and speedy consignment to a life-long to bondage, were too precious a blessing to be put in jeopardy, by submission to a tribunal so fearful as a jury. Tell me how much we do for Freedom, but how much can we do for Slavery, has been the tact assumption of the age. But I pass by this for future objection.

The fugitive slave bill purports to confer judicial power upon persons who are not judges. It provides for the trial of human beings, by officers called "commissioners," and upon these it is said on high authority, to confer *original* and *final* jurisdiction on questions of liberty. The Constitution declares in whom "the judicial power of the United States shall be vested." It shall be vested "in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as may from time to time establish." No commissioner nor any number of commissioners constitute one of these courts. "The Judges, both of the Supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behavior." A commissioner can be made and unmade, on any day. These judges are to "receive for their services a compensation, which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office." The commissioners are compensated by fees, contingent on their decisions, and as still discussed, on one side, as though we were bound to avoid the jury trial it we could; not as though we were bound to seek it, if by fair interpretation we might. It has been discussed as though the jury trial, to protect a man's right to himself, were an evil; and as though the sudden seizure, without any judgment, and speedy consignment to a life-long to bondage, were too precious a blessing to be put in jeopardy, by submission to a tribunal so fearful as a jury. Tell me how much we do for Freedom, but how much can we do for Slavery, has been the tact assumption of the age. But I pass by this for future objection.

The fugitive slave bill purports to confer judicial power upon persons who are not judges. It provides for the trial of human beings, by officers called "commissioners," and upon these it is said on high authority, to confer *original* and *final* jurisdiction on questions of liberty. The Constitution declares in whom "the judicial power of the United States shall be vested." It shall be vested "in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as may from time to time establish." No commissioner nor any number of commissioners constitute one of these courts. "The Judges, both of the Supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behavior." A commissioner can be made and unmade, on any day. These judges are to "receive for their services a compensation, which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office." The commissioners are compensated by fees, contingent on their decisions, and the President nominates and the Senate confirms judges of the supreme and inferior courts. Commissioners are only the "inferior officers" who may be appointed by "the courts of law."

I need not enforce the position, that the power which this Bill purports to confer upon commissioners is a judicial power. It is a judicial power. It is a judicial power. It is original and exclusive. They are "to hear and determine." The fourth section says that they are to "exercise jurisdiction similar with the judges of the circuit and district courts of the United States." The Attorney General of the United States, in his instructions to the Commander of the President of the United States, says as follows:—"These officers and each of them [the commissioners] have *judicial* power, and jurisdiction to hear and determine the facts. The certificate to be granted to the owner is to be regarded as the act and judgment of a judicial tribunal." Judge Longyear, of Michigan, says, "Congress has constituted a tribunal with exclusive jurisdiction to determine summarily, and without appeal, who is a slave, and who is free." "The judgment of the tribunal created by this act is conclusive upon all tribunals." "The power of a commissioner, therefore, is the power of a tribunal, within the sense of the constitution. His decision cannot be re-heard or re-examined by any judge, or by any court, of any State, or of the United States. In no other case can a commissioner perform any judicial act, or issue any executive order, whose validity may not be re-examined in the court for which he acts, or in some other. He cannot strike a blow, nor fine a dollar, nor punish by imprisonment for an hour. No appeal, by injunction, by mandamus or certiorari, the proceedings of inferior courts or magistrates can be reached, and their legality or constitutionality tested. But here a multitude of tribunals are established over whose proceedings, not the Supreme Court of any State; no, not even the Supreme Court of the United States, has supervision. And what do these commissioners decide? That a man has no right to himself; that he is the property of others; that he *owes service.*—Suppose the question were whether the respondent owed the claimant a dollar. Could the commissioner give judgment and issue execution for it? Certainly not. But yet he is here authorized to decide questions infinitely more important, in any amount of money. He is to decide that a man owes life-long service from himself, and from all the children of his body.

But the surrender of an alleged fugitive from service has been compared with the surrender of a fugitive from justice; and he therefore, the Executive of a State is required by the law of 1793 to surrender fugitives from justice, it is claimed that any commissioner may surrender fugitives from service, *without liability to question or accountability by any human authority.* But there is a world-wide difference between these cases. When the fugitive from justice is delivered up, he is delivered into the custody of the law. Legal process must have been commenced against him in the State from which he fled. He is returned to the proceedings thus commenced may be consummated. He is never entrusted to private hands. The shield of the law is continued over him. After arrest, he is merely transferred from the hands of the law in one State, to the hands of the law in another State. He is transferred, not to private hands, but to have one. But in the alleged slave is delivered up, not into the custody of the law, where his rights might be adjudicated upon, but into private hands; and into the hands of a neutral or indifferent person, but into the hands of a party interested to deprive him of all his rights:—he be not a slave, that is to be kidnapped and a manstealer. Mr. Clay saw this, and his plan provided that the alleged fugitive should be sent home *to be tried.* But his South by proposed a law, that was not passed, by which one class of men have less security for their freedom than another class have for their estate.

It is magnanimous to say, that when an alleged fugitive has reached his claimant's domicile, he may there petition for freedom. Should he do so, it would be an independent and original proceeding, instituted under *another* government. Not only would the jurisdiction be different, but the character of the litigants would be changed, the plaintiff for defendant, and defendant for plaintiff. The old case is not renewed, but a new one tried. Indeed, a very intelligent writer on this subject has queried whether the certificate of the Commissioner may not be pleaded as an estopped. I say then that, in effect, the Commissioner by this act, has *original final and exclusive* jurisdiction of a "case" "in law," "arising under the constitution and laws of the United States." This is the very province of judges and courts. This is the identical power which the constitution of the United States vests in judges who are to be nominated by the President, confirmed by the Senate, to hold office during good behavior, and to be compensated by fixed salaries.

Again, the bill compels a man to bondage, without crime, on evidence which he has had no opportunity to controvert. The claimant must prove three facts before the commissioner,—1st, That the person named in the warrant owes a life-long service; 2d. That he has escaped; 3d, identity.

Now, according to the bill, the first two points—the facts of owing service and escaping—may be proved behind the respondent's back. This proof may be procured against the alleged fugitive without any notice to him, and without any

half a dozen cases of surrender. Yet for this greater labor, the commissioner is to have but half price.—In assailing all we love of liberty could not the framers and supporters of this measure have forborne from so cruel an insult? We feel it deeply.

The cases are to be "heard and determined," as they were under Rubespierre, "*in a summary manner.*" Shakspeare enumerates "the law's delay" among the causes of suicide. Under this bill, real suicides will doubtless be occasioned by the *lives despaired.* The "summary manner" means the quietus of wrong. Does not every lawyer and every client know that when an action is brought for the infinitial execution of a contract, in building a house or a ship, or for the balance of an account or for flowing lands or for defamation or libel, the defendant needs weeks and often months to make ready for his defence. His witness may be in another State or abroad; it may be necessary to examine ancient titles in repositories of deeds or of wills, to make surveys of premises, or investigations into character and conduct. It often happens that when process is first served upon a man, he does not know the grounds of his own defence. They may consist of facts which he has forgotten, or of law of which he is ignorant. Our courts, acting on a few well-known truth, have established a rule that a party, even after he has had fourteen days' notice, shall be entitled to a continuance as a matter of right, when under special circumstances: and he may always have it on cause shown. I ask any defendant who was ever forced into court to state what is the last magistrate or difficulty, whether he was ready to do so on the instant when process was served upon him. Yet this is what this respondent must do under the Fugitive Slave Bill. On the 12th day of last September, James Hamlet was peacefully pursuing a lawful occupation in Water-street New York, and earning an honest support for his wife and children. In three hours, handcuffed, in irons, and surrounded by armed men, he was on his way to the House of Bondage. No time was given him to procure the aid of counsel. He declared he was free, that his mother was a free woman, and he was a free man. But by another provision in the bill, it is declared that "in no trial or hearing under this act, shall the testimony of such alleged fugitive be admitted in evidence." In all other cases, within the broad compass of the common or statute law of Great Britain or of this country, a party litigant may give evidence pertaining to the suit. In some cases, he may give evidence on the merits; in all cases, he may make affidavit on interlocutory matters. A man who has been in the State prison, a felon convicted of perjury, may still make affidavit, in his own case, under certain circumstances, though he can testify neither for nor against any other person. But an alleged fugitive can make oath to no fact, and make no circumstances, for delay or other cause. It would conflict with that "summary manner" in which it is decreed expedient to dispose of human liberty.

Look at this provision under the light of a few facts In the case of Mahoney v. Ashton, (4 Harris & McHenry's Maryland Reports,) the question of freedom claimed that a maternal ancestor, *four generations back*, who had been brought over by Lord Baltimore, in the early days of the colony, was free, and, by an extraordinary chain of evidence, he traced his descent from that free source. It was a claim which any court in Massachusetts would have sustained, without hesitation.

Now how much of evidence, of history, of record, of parol, does the bare mention of such a case suggest? Who could have been prepared to try it in three hours; aye, as soon as he could be seized and hurried to a lawyer's office?

Among the alleged legislative rules in the "Pearl cases" so called, which I assisted in trying in Washington, in the years 1848 and '49, was the family of Daniel Bell, consisting of his wife and [illegible] seven children. The mother and children had been freed many years before by deed of manumission, executed by their master in his last sickness, and they had been repaired free ever since. Years after the grantor's death the device was started of proving him to be of "unsound mind," and thus reclaiming the family to bondage. But a hangnerian, who prepared the deed, witnessed its execution, and took the acknowledgment, declared that he stood ready to testify to the conveyancing of the grantor and the validity of the instrument. Years passed away and he died. Immediately, the heirs claimed the family as slaves: and the witness of the deed, and

ling at the foundation, by denying our Christian character, and regarding this council of the Church of God as the mere civil government of a society, wherein human expediency is to be invoked instead of the guidance of the Holy Spirit—where our passions and prejudices may be consulted to determine the measure of our love to our fellow-men—the communion of saints is made to depend upon affinity for social companionship, and where those whose agreeableness is questioned, are turned away with the unchristian sentiment, "Go home this report, to have a Church or denomination of their own, and pray ourselves in their place to be excluded society—it is only by such unhallowed arguments that the committee can maintain their recommendation—yet these things we do not ask us to do, but we do ask us to dishonor our profession, and deliberately to sin against God, against our brethren, and against our own souls.

If we yield to their solicitations, backed as they are by the clamors of the proud and ungodly mob within these sacred walls; if we thus insult the Great Head of the Church, and plunge, with our eyes open, into their error, ignorance, pride, and prejudices, those who we have brought Him to save us; if we accept this proffered gift of human expediency, instead of the dictates of His Holy Spirit; if, instead of gathering His dispersed sheep—those whom a heartless world has worried and torn—into one fold, we drive them from where they seek to enter—then may we believe, and tremble as we believe, that we have lost very much to represent "the comfortable doctrine of Christ from being truly preached, truly received, and truly followed, to the breaking down of the kingdoms of sin, satan, and death."

For our loyalty as steadfastness in unpopular truth, on the part of Christians, tends to enlarge and establish the kingdom of God on earth, as certainly does the treacherous spirit of compromise, which would bind them fast in the multitude, strengthen and confirm the world in its ignorance and sin. And, sir, from my own careful observations, I am led to conclude that the weight of this judgment I have confidence. I think there can be no manner of doubt, that the conduct of the American Church towards the colored people in the United States, both at the North and at the South, in regarding with indifference their wrongs and their sorrows—regarding them as shields and administering no rebuke to the legalized and brutal oppression to which they are the innocent and unresisting victims, has tended to lull, and bring to thus oppression a direct sanction, encouraging a great and growing evil, which, if not checked, bringing in its tunnels and its temples a degrading caste, has so shocked the moral senses of thousands, that they have turned from the Church with a feeling of disgust, and, sometimes, judging the holiness of its principles by the pride and prejudice of its members, have been beguiled into the slough of infidelity; finding portrayed in Christ, in the benevolence of worldly philanthropy, after being sickened and disgusted with the selfishness and inhumanity of Churchmen towards their brethren of a darker hue.

The eyes of the world are now fixed upon this Convention; your proceedings are the theme of every corner. If you reject these churches, weigh well the responsibility. It is not merely the division of right to these two parties, the violation of the unity of the Church, but it is, by their admission—it is much more than this. It is the formal recognition of a system of slavery in the Church, which God has expressly forbidden; it is a sanction of that *caste* as it exists in the world around us; an encouragement to the oppressor, and a cause of deep and poignancy to the oppressed. Where are the colored race, stripped of the dearest of their dearest personal rights, and hunted? Ke beats over our fire-side borders—where are they to seek for succor if the Church forsakes them, and denies admission to her even acknowledged children; her own ordained ministers, sent forth to officiate before God, but deemed unfit to sit here in company with their fellow-men? It will be a base surrender of our holiest principles, our most binding duties, in a crisis of the most fearful magnitude, so a wordly fear of the consequences, to the Church or to ourselves. It would be a base surrender of *our faith* to our friends, and to our Redeemer, who, in spurned rock, we dare to reason upon the expediency of obeying God's plain command. It will degrade us in our own estimation and in that of the world. For the world will see that the Church has no more principle, nor dignity, nor humanity than itself. Its friends will see that where we have committed a sin with our eyes open; an act, whose consequences and influence we can never stay, but which, having put forth the impulse, we cannot, we may continue to operate for evil from the moment of its commission until the judgment-day

In God's name be free from responsibilities from unholy influences, and stand erect as Christians. Let us shake from our lips the cry of the world, and its pride and prejudice from which we have brought him to save us. And not only as Christian gentlemen let us scorn the contemptible doctrine, but as men, let us rise in our manhood to look down upon those who are beneath them in acquirements, in station, or in influence, but as members of a Council of the Church of God, let us, to his Almighty Head for guidance, let us so act as to preserve its purity unmarred by the slightest of expediency, its unity unbroken by caste or schism. Let us give these churches to our Convention, divorcing from the circumstance of color a nonconformity to the Church's usage, apostolic precedent, and Christ's injunction. Let us welcome them to our hearts, and, if we have any, let us give fervid reports behalf; let us exhibit the strength of our principles, by braving the sneers and frowns of all, whether in or out of the Church, and by the mildness and recession the remark, as did the early Christians of the Church, "Behold how these brethren love one another."

I have very little more to say. I have questioned before the Convention for its inimitable action; and if it be in order, I would prefer that the report of the Committee on that resolution that these churches be admitted, but upon the same question in the negative form of the resolution recommended for our adoption by the majority of the select committee in this report, now waiting for our action.—"That these churches be not admitted."

Mr. William H. Hall has now demanded that the motion of the gentleman should be reduced to writing.

Mr. Jay said that the resolution of the committee was before the Convention, and he called for the vote upon it, and asked the Chair to decide whether he had not the right to do so.

The Chairman (Dr. Creighton,) declared himself unprepared to determine this question.

Mr. Hall said it was a clear case. This motion was not postponed from 1846 to 1847, and then passed by. Not having been then acted upon, it could not be considered unfinished business, and was not so such by this Convention. It had long since fallen to the ground, and it was now resuscitated, and he thought it very unfair now to renew it without notice. He hoped if the matter were taken up, members would be allowed time to prepare themselves.

Mr. Baddin having been appealed to for advice by the point of order, stated that the subject was undoubtedly unfinished business under the order of business before the Convention; but that not having been by rule, or by the order of the Convention, referred precisely to this Convention, it must be formally taken up by express resolution.

The Chair thought he had decided that the report were not before the Convention, but that a resolution to consider them would be in order.

Mr. Jay offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That this Convention do now proceed to consider the report of the committee on the Church of St. Philip's, and the Church of the Messiah, New York, which were made to this body in the year 1846, and which were referred to the Committee upon by the Committee on the Incorporation of Churches

Mr. Livingston raised a question of order on the presentation of the report, stating, as a reason, that it interrupted the prescribed order of business.

The Secretary (Rev. Dr. Hodgins) maintained the view that it was out of order on this ground, as the Convention had already passed beyond the order of the incorporation of churches, and the business was introduced. The roll of delegates had been called intermediately.

Mr Jay explained that he rose immediately upon the conclusion of the proceedings under the Report of the Committee on the Incorporation of Churches, he yielded from courtesy to the Secretary who was commencing to call the list of new delegates, that having nothing to do with the intermediate business of business.

Dr. Anthon said that it was so, and that Mr. Jay was clearly entitled to the floor; he had risen before the Convention passed to the order of business.

The Secretary was still fixed with this explanation, and withdrew his objection on the ground of it.

The Chair asked the question to be on the resolution offered by Mr. Jay.

Hon. J. C. Spencer rose to a question of order, and contended that there was no application from these churches for admission, upon which the Convention would act. The application was signed by a few persons were made four years since, and have never been renewed. The parishes may have ceased to exist, or may no longer desire admission; such a new application was clearly necessary.

Mr. Jay said he was well aware that there were many gentlemen on that floor determined to avoid, if possible, being brought to a direct vote upon this question, but this was a direct application to him unfairly—These churches applied for admission in the proper form, their application was referred to the Committee on the Incorporation of Churches, who reported that they were entitled to admission. The subject was then referred to the Special Committee, whose report was laid over for one year, and then again laid upon the table, where they are lying now, only waiting the passage of this resolution to be taken up. How can it be said with truth that there are no applications before us? Have they been withdrawn? We know that they have not. Had these churches supposed that we required a new application they would have made it; as it was, they had good reason to believe that a new application would be deemed disrespectful, as indicating impatience at our delay in deciding upon the applications already before us. This Convention have the power to exclude these churches if they think fit to do so; but let it be done in a fair way by a direct vote, and not under the cover of the technical objections and points of order such as this.

The Chairman ruled that the objection were well taken, that there was no application before the Convention and that consequently, the resolution was out of order, and he accordingly appealed from the decision of the chair.

The Chairman stated the question before the House to be on the appeal from his decision.

Dr. Hawes maintained at some length that the decision was in strict conformity to parliamentary rules, that a departure from it would lead to great inconvenience, and the unexpected introduction of matters long past by, and expressed the hope that the members of this Convention would not depart from the rule of looking to the record to determine what matters were in order, but would sustain the decision.

Mr. Jay said he rose to withdraw the appeal he had taken, and begged the Chairman to give some reason why he would take an early opportunity of renewing his motion for the admission of these churches on a new application, and that he hoped the question would then be decided upon its merits.

Communications

Castle Garden vs. Blackstone

One orator said, "The master has the same claim to the services of the slave, as you have, as parents, to the obedience of your children."

This is the language of Sandford, an orator who made a speech on this subject at Castle Garden.

Now let us hear another man quite as renowned in his day as any of the orators at Castle Garden claim to be. He says

"Pure and proper Slavery does not, nay cannot, subsist in England, such I mean whereby an absolute and unlimited power is given to the master over the life and fortune of the slave. And, indeed, it is repugnant to reason, and the principles of natural law, that such a state should subsist anywhere. The three grounds of the right of Slavery, assigned by Justinian, are all of them built upon false foundations. As, first, Slavery is held to arise '*jure gentium*,' from a state of captivity in war; whence slaves are called '*Mancipia, quasi manus capti*. The conqueror, say they, acquires a right to the life of his captive; and, having spared that, has a right to deal with him as he pleased. But it is an untrue position, when taken generally, that by the law of nature, or nations, a man may kill his enemy: he has only a right to kill him, in certain cases; in cases of absolute necessity, for self defence; and it is plain the slaughter of necessity did not subsist, since the victor did not actually kill him, but made him prisoner. War is itself justifiable only on principle of self-preservation; and it gives no other right to other rights over prisoners but merely to disable them from doing harm to us, by confining their persons; much less can it give a right to kill, torture, abuse, plunder, or even to enslave, an enemy, when the war is over. Blackstone adds, that slavery is also given by capitivity depends on a supposed right of slaughter, that foundation failing, the consequence drawn from it must fill likewise. But, secondly, it is said that Slavery may begin '*jure civili*,' when one man sells himself to another. This is only means of contracts to serve or work for another, in very just; but when applied to strict Slavery, in the sense of the laws of old Rome or Modern Barbary, is also impossible. Every sale implies a price, said pro quo, an equivalent given to the seller in lieu of what he transfers to the buyer: but what equivalent can be given for life, and liberty; both of which, in absolute Slavery, are held to be at the master's disposal? His property, also, he very price seems to resume, devolves '*ipso facto* to his master, the instant he becomes a slave. In this case, therefore, the buyer gives nothing and the seller receives nothing: of what validity then can a sale be, which destroys the very principle upon which sales are founded? Lastly, we are told, that besides these two ways by which slaves '*fiunt*' or are acquired, they may also be hereditary: '*servi nascuntur*;' the children of acquired slaves are '*jure natura*, by a negative kind of birthright, slaves also. But this, being built on the two former rights, must fall together with them. If neither captivity, nor the sale of one's self, can by the law of nature and reason reduce the parent to Slavery, much less can they reduce the offspring. (1. Blackstone commentaries, book 1, ch. 14.)

It appears to us that Dr. Blackstone is quite as good authority as any of the late orators at Castle Garden.

MADISON.

Public Meeting

A large and enthusiastic meeting of the colored citizens of Canandaigua was held at the Court House on the evening of the 31st of October, for the purpose of adopting measures in relation to their action on the Fugitive Slave Bill, passed at the recent session of Congress. The meeting being called to order, on motion, Mr. Austin Steward was appointed Chairman, and A. Steward, Jr. Secretary; and, on motion of Mr. H. W. Johnson, M. A. Blake and A. Haley were appointed Vice Presidents.

On motion the Bill was read, and a Business Committee of five was appointed and retired.

Mr. Rankin, of Ohio, then addressed the audience. The Committee then returned and reported their resolutions, they were read by the Chairman of the Committee, Mr H. F. Johnson then rose, and in a very able manner examined the prominent features of the odious Bill, proving conclusively its unconstitutionality. It was moved that the thanks of the citizens be returned to the Sheriff of the County for his kindness in opening the house for our reception; carried. On motion it was resolved that the proceedings of this meeting be published in the *Anti-Slavery Standard*, the meeting then adjourned.

A. STEWARD, President.
A. Steward, Jr., Secretary

Foreign Correspondence.

From our Dublin Correspondent.

DUBLIN, Oct. 18th, 1850.

My Dear Gay: It is a long time since we heard from each other, but you have been, nevertheless, the frequent companion of my thoughts, particularly within the last few days, in which time I have been silently thanking you for the attention you showed the lad of my Irish friends that I recommended to your good offices. I have had my hands of late so full of "books and works," though not much of "healthful play," that I have not had time for writing; but I need not tell you the little space at my command just now with empty apologies So here for

I don't know any thing that has happened since you last heard from me that excited so much stir in the three kingdoms as the mobbing of Marshal Haynau by Barclay & Perkins' draymen. If any thing else had occurred, for London, it stirred London. I recollect nothing of the kind which has excited such general complacency in the British islands since Nicholas Nickleby threshed Mr. Squeers. You recollect how every body was pleased. The Sandy mommies of the latter memorable event, I happened to be walking behind a parsonable, I suppose, were going to church, and I overheard the gentleman say to the lady, in tones of unappressed exultation, "Oh, did not he give him a capital dressing?" In fact, Dickens's story was universally read, and the leading incidents history of that fact. And so did Barclay & Perkins' draymen, by the tumultuous uprising of their indignant humanity. The *Times*, the *Morning Chronicle*, the *Morning Post*, and all the champions of aristocracy, attacked the London Daily green, stormed and raved; but still John Bull shook and chuckled in the immensity of his satisfaction. I was in London shortly after, and had the great pleasure of seeing the illustrious Joseph Mazzini, the Roman triumvir, there. I heard (but not from himself) that he attended very great value to the drayment's demonstration, believing that it would show unmistakably the feelings of the English masses towards such monsters as Haynau and the wretches that employed him and hounded him on. I have read even of peace meetings in which, while they condemned the act, the speakers (clergymen and Friends included) spoke of it in such terms as plainly proved that they were decidedly more pleased than vexed. Indeed, with the most intensely virtuous, if in all, it is exceedingly difficult, under some circumstances, to find this one of them; for the heart is too strong for the behind for the head.

It is only yesterday I heard that George Thompson is likely to visit the United States immediately, and he may probably sail in the same ship that will be the forerunner of this beautiful epistle. I shall be extremely anxious to hear what reception he will get in the country that banned him from her shores 15 years ago. I am confident that, as an Abolitionist, he is unchanged. Whether the popular feeling of the American people can be, in the same sense, unchanged, this time, his visit will prove. This visit must be intensely interesting to him. Notwithstanding all we have heard (I have no doubt truly) of the amelioration of the popular mind in consequence of the agitation of the Abolitionists, all we read the Anti-Slavery papers at a distance from the field of your labor must feel that there is an immensity to be done before Slavery ceases to be what, it is now, the corner stone of your republican edifice, and that people and gloriously as they can, safely drag the whole American people, except the Abolitionists, through the dirt to any extent, provided the object be to protect and foster the beloved "peculiar institution." When any particularly hateful, immoral, unpopular measure is passed the Abolitionists, before its passage of the Reform Bill, it was easy to attribute it, and with truth, to Court, or Church, or Aristocracy, and the people washed their hands of it. Since the Reform Bill, its sole or principal support is the mass of the humbler portion of the British people can pass the British Parliament. I cannot comprehend how such an infamous enactment, as the Fugitive Slave Bill, so vile in its provisions, and so horribly hostile to the plainest claims of humanity, justice, and law, could have passed the American Congress after such full deliberation, unless it had the consent of the greatest and most influential portion of the American people. The Abolitionists need great hearing to be able to refuse to do this. Yet, if the triumph of right while the victory of evil is so astoundingly rampant. I wish George Thompson all the happiness his anticipates from the sight of so many of his warmest, truest and best friends. I am sure he must feel delighted at the sight of so many of his friends, the former years, of his noblest efforts and his greatest triumphs. For my part, he was the first to create a warm interest on behalf of the Slave Question in our many mind, and I have to thank him for my acquaintance with many men I prize highly, and to whom friendship I am continually indebted.

You remember my friend that you visited in New York, and who passed on at once to Ohio. Well, they have had a dull time of it since they settled as "free soil" emigrants, in consequence of the Fugitive Bill. They have had fever and ague, and hard work, and a great want of old faces, and not very much congenial society, and plenty of democracy; and I am not quite clear they would not like to be back again. May-be it only the natural effect of disappointed hope, or experience they have had at the first going off, all may go on smart and smooth in the time to come. I am sure I hope so. But I would not like to follow, except for a visit. I am too old to begin to mold the axe. If I tried, I might perhaps be taken for the world's old Queen's country mower that Sir Jonah Barrington tells of. He was walking home one day along the banks of the river Barrow, with his scythe over his shoulder. Seeing a fine salmon in the water, he lifted up the handle of his scythe (forgetting the blade) and attempted to spear the fish. With the force of the blow he out his own head off, to the horror of some millers who saw the hapless member roll over the mill dam, a little way down. I don't vouch for this story of Sir Jonah's; but no doubt it is likely as true as a great deal that passes for very good history.

I wish you would tell your Boston Correspondent that I am forever obliged to him for his account of the Mock Funeral of General Taylor in Boston. I read it twenty times over, and I shall display I ever heard of. What a strange night it must have been to see a multitude of men of mature age, the linest descendants of the grim puritans who hanged Marmaduke Stevenson and Mary Dyer, making a cheerful, lively and even noisy and jocular procession of low, who, when alive, had 300 niggers of his own to larrup, "gave Hell" to the Mexicans, and was full of indignation against Haynau, who was mobbed by the London draymen for presiding over the flogging of a single white Hungarian! Well, the draymen mobbed, they would find plenty of Haynaus to mob among the Southern Chivalry who visit the Brewery from time to time. Some great men absorb the celebrity that belongs to other people. Some great villains get more disgrace than they deserve. Well, I have no doubt Mrs. Ellen Craft were consulted, she would tell you of plenty of Haynaus in Georgia.

Yours ever truly,

RICH'D D. WEBB.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Important debate in the Virginia convention on the expulsion of free negroes.

Gamaliel Bailey, Esq., of Cincinnati, broke up the following resolution offered by him yesterday: on his motion, the blank was filled with the word "seven."

"And whereas, the committee of this House appointed to enquire into the expediency of inserting a clause in the constitution, declaring void all laws now in force, by which free negroes and mulattoes are compelled, and their descendants, may be permitted to remain within the limits of the commonwealth, and to restrain the Legislative department of the government from passing any law granting, permission to any such emancipated slave to reside in the commonwealth, within the commonwealth; and to provide that it shall be competent to the Legislature to pass laws for the removal of free negroes and mulattoes, with the consent of this commonwealth, either with or without the consent of such free negroes and mulattoes.

Mr. Whittle offered some reasons why this resolution should be referred to a special committee. He thought the subject matter of the resolution which had been referred to the legislative committee, would prevent that committee from examining it to fully as its great importance demanded. It was a question which involved the peace of the Society of our state. It concerned a tribe of people among us, who were potent for evil and impotent for any good.

Mr. Lyons offered the following amendment, to come in at the end of the resolution, "and that the subject be referred to a select committee."

Mr. Bailey said the lapse of twelve months, no deed or will emancipating slaves, shall be admitted to record in any court of this state."

Mr. Bailey said the object of his amendment was not to prevent any man from emancipating, in a proper way, his slaves during his life time, but to prevent a man, who, after spending his labor from his youth, during his life time, at the time of his death seeks to get a manumission of his property, emancipating his slaves, and to save the community from the evil which was inflicted upon it by free negroes. Besides this, these emancipations are in violation of the law, and recognized by the existence of Slavery, as an evidence of reverence for having committed the act of holding slaves in bondage. He wished to see a quietus upon this species of this being true.

Mr. Bayly declared time to look into the resolution, as it might regulate his vote upon it. He moved to lay it, as amended, on the table. Motion rejected.

Mr. Mason moved to strike out the words "nor any act of the Legislature."

Mr. Botts regarded this as a very important question. The resolution was to be referred to a select committee. He was little disposed, nor prepared to enter into an argument upon the question. But for the purpose of giving the sense of the sense of this House, he would offer the following, as a substitute for the resolution.

(The resolution is inserted below.)

Mr. Hopkins of W., hoped that the resolution, if adopted, would go to the legislative and not a special committee. He saw no reason for varying from ordinary committee.

Mr. Whittle urged that the legislative committee was not properly constituted to give a proper consideration to the question. He deemed it of sufficient importance to be put to rest by a constitutional provision. All he wished was to give the Legislature the power to act if it should become necessary, in this particular. He did not propose, as the member from Marion's amendment indicated, to engraft any system upon the constitution, but merely to declare a general principle, which was all that ought to be done when a body was going to write the law in iron. This tribe of people had increased in our State to an alarming extent. They were adverse in feeling, adverse in sentiment, and adverse in interest, to every community in which they are found. They had increased some 47 per cent in the West, and some 7 or 8 per cent in his own district.

Mr. Stuart of Morgan, had been a member of a committee in the Legislature on this subject, and recollected that the examination made in that body had confirmed all that had been said by the member from Botts.

Mr. Straughan offered the following as an amendment to the amendment of Mr. Neeson:

"And to purchase territory from the Federal Government, to facilitate such removal, upon which to form a such free negroes and mulattoes, as may be required from the commonwealth."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. Neeson's amendment was also rejected.

Mr. Botts then rose and explained the difference between it and the resolution of the member from Pittsylvania; and expressed his dissatisfaction and disapprobation of the resolution. In his judgment, it proposed to interfere with the vested rights of such of these free negroes as had obtained permission to remain in the commonwealth. He was desirous of acting upon this subject, but not with cruelty or harshness. Here might be a man who, at the time of his death, might emancipate his slaves—they might be old and infirm, and yet you propose to compel the man and their families and friends without providing means for their transportation.

Mr. Lyons explained his amendment.

Mr. Whittle appealed to him to withdraw it. He feared it would embarrass the question.

Mr. Strother urged the adoption of the resolution of the member from Pittsylvania. He was prepared. Will not the Legislature pass laws for the removal in obedience to its provisions. These free negroes were not citizens; they had none of the rights of citizens; they are not an integral portion of our community; and their presence among us induces a disease which is calculated to destroy the peace of the State.

Mr. Shelley was opposed to the bad precedent which would be established by creating these special committees, and hoped they would not be made.

Mr. Hopkins of W., moved to amend the resolution, so as to make it one of reference to the "Legislative Committee."

Mr. Ferguson offered a resolution creating a standing committee on slavery, the free negro population and rights of the commonwealth. (Afterwards withdrawn.)

Mr. Bailey did not desire to embrace the proposition of any member, nor to stifle inquiry. He withdrew his amendment, and would offer it separately.

Mr. Taylor moved to lay the resolution upon the motion of Mr. Hopkins, of W. to strike out a portion of the first line of the resolution, and to make an inserting one so as to make the resolution of the member from Pittsylvania committee. The vote stood as follows: ayes 100, nays 50.

The amendment of Mr. Hopkins, of W. was adopted.

Mr. Whittle's resolution as amended, was then adopted.

Mr. Botts's resolution was adopted, and is as follows:

Resolved, That the committee on the Legislative Department of the Government be instructed to inquire into the expediency of inserting in the Bill of Rights, a clause to be emancipated shall be entitled to his or her freedom, unless the person so emancipating such slave or slaves shall first make provision for the support of such as may be authorised by the Legislature to remain in the commonwealth.

Mr. Lyon's resolution was adopted, and is as follows.

Resolved, That the committee on the Legislative Department be instructed to inquire into the expediency of inserting in the Constitution a provision, providing that no deed or will emancipating a slave or slaves, shall be admitted to record in any Court in this Commonwealth or far as it does emancipate such slave or slaves.

—The present number of postmistresses in the United States is eighty-two.

—The Rev. Dr. Wardlow, the celebrated Scotish divine, arrived in Boston by the last steamer.

—The Indiana Convention has rejected the proposition to allow negroes the elective franchise, by a vote of ayes 1 nays 124.

Emancipation.—Reads Washington Esq., of Pittsburgh, to the family of Gen. Washington, has resigned his office of U. S. Commissioner, as he will not serve under the Fugitive Slave Bill.

—The (Washington.) "*Republic*" says "the citizens of Boston can preserve their own peace and order, and will preserve them at all hazards, and at all necessity, but if unfortunately an emergency should occur in which the aid of the President may be required, he would be given without hesitation to the full extent of his Constitutional power.

—The Circuit Court of Culpepper county, Va. on Monday were blam. Jacob Brooks, a free negro, for a number of witnesses summoned in the case of those who were charged with the abduction of a free negro, Wm. Grayson. After deliberation, the Grand Jury refused to make any presentment.

—Slave Hunter Killed by a Fugitive.—John A. Butler of Edgefield Mississippi, was killed on the 23d ult. by two runaway slaves which he was in chase of, and was about to flog for having fled from their projects.

—Mr. Jenkins (The Tribune's Mrs. Harris) has discovered that the bill which recently passed Congress in regard to Oregon, grants the right of settlement to citizens of the United States, or persons who shall have resided in the Territory of Oregon, and shall be entitled to a certain portion of land in the far-off Territory, and he, Mr. Jenkins, desires to know (says the Tribune) if Mr. Burnett, the Chairman of the Committee, the process of "becoming such," has put in his claim.

—A Good Runner.—Some of our contemporaries (says the *Post*, which will not let poor Brooks alone) express their surprise that Mr. Brooks should have run well in his district. If they had seen him run when he was a boy, they would not wonder at his success in politics. Mr. Brooks, if you wish to see tell running, let them wait till next winter, when the question is to be decided in Congress.

—An Executive Anecdote.—The following anecdote is told in a letter from the Washington correspondent of the Philadelphia Ledger, of a conversation with the President, and it gives us pleasure to transfer it to our columns.

"A distinguished gentlemen from the West—an Ex-Senator—called on Mr. Fillmore, and, after exchanging the usual courtesies, was asked by the President if he had seen the Fugitive Slave Bill, and what it is. The reply was, that the law, although unpopular in his State, would doubtless be enforced. The President was playfully made, that, as the President was sworn to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution and laws," he [the Ex-Senator] was sure Mr. Fillmore would execute *this law* 'To the very letter, sir,' was the instant reply of the President—'to the very letter, sir, whatever may be the consequences.' The gentleman was worthy the palmiest days of 'Old Hickory' himself.—*Washington Union.*

—Another Anecdote.—It gives us pleasure to state another anecdote about the President, for which we vouch, as we had it from two gentlemen from the West, who were in the President's room when the conversation yesterday morning. They were applying to him for the appointment of a gentleman as attorney for the United States in one of the Western States, and in discussing the qualifications of the candidate, Mr. Fillmore said he was a good lawyer, but he feared he was a deemed independable. He said he was determined to execute faithfully the Fugitive Slave law, and would appoint no man to office who was not willing to assist in the administration of that law, who would not zealously cooperate in its execution.

On another occasion, he said, he understand from good authority, that the President declared that the law should be executed in every instance and to the letter of the law.

This is the spirit alone in which the Union can be preserved.—*Ibid.*

—Fugitive Slave Law at the North.—It has been estimated by the author of a pamphlet published not long since, at Washington, under the name of "Randolph of Roanoke," that the number of fugitive slaves who have escaped from the South between 1810 and 1850, and taken residence in the Free States and in the North, amounts to 46,224—and that 15,400 have escaped between 1840 and 1850—making a total of 61,624, in the period from 1810 to 1850 inclusive. Valuing each slave at $450, the annual loss has been $27,000, and the total loss $27,730,800.

The author argues from these facts, that the difference between the actual increase of the free black population of the North, from natural causes, and the actual increase would have been if left to natural causes. The writer also estimates that considerably more free negroes migrate from the free States to the slave States than from the slave to the free States.

A Strike against Color.—Yesterday morning (says a Tribune last week) Mr. Dennis Harris employed a colored man to work in the cellar of his house, building he is now erecting in Dunne st. This was the signal for about sixty or seventy Irishmen engaged at labourers to strike at once and refuse to work unless the colored man was immediately dismissed. Mr. Harris decided that the poor man, the unwilling cause of the trouble, should be continued at say rate. The strikers afterward offered to make up a purse for the colored man, if he was dismissed. But, said Mr. Harris, ten thousand dollars cannot purchase his dismissal. Consequently, the building remain larger supplier of Stockings, Mittens, etc., than heretofore, as we have never been able in this respect to meet the demand.

Any donations of materials, such as silk, cotton, linen, calico, etc., will be gratefully received by any member of the committee.

The Liberty Bell will be published at the opening of the Bazaar, and will, we trust, include a wider circle of distinguished writers than ever before. We solicit pecuniary donations from all who have hitherto given his signatures to the call for the great Pence Meeting were canvassed for.

Mr. Becker, a trembler, in his store. Enter Mr. Bland, a dry goods jobber.

Mr. Bland. Good morning, Mr. Becker! Will you just give us your name to the call for the Union meeting, to sustain the Constitution and laws, and put down Anti-Slavery agitation?

Mr. Becker. I should want to think a while first. On the whole, I don't see any need of such a meeting, and I guess I won't sign.

Mr. Bland. You do, eh! Well, Sir! *I have orders to fill for Southern customers, and I guess I shall look for them elsewhere hereafter.*

Mr. Becker. Of course, Mr. Bland! If you suppose you buy me in buying your goods, I guess you will be sure to patronize somebody else in future. [Exit Bland, hastily.]

Such was the purport of a conversation which actually took place. We have changed the names, and the article dealt in by Becker, but nothing essential.—*Tribune.*

RECEIPTS FOR THE STANDARD.

From October 1, to November 1, 1850.

590	Nathan Page, Danvers New Mills Mass.	2 00
538	Richard C. Warner, N. Y. City.	4 00
564	Peter Wilson, N. Y. City.	1 00
540	Geo. P. Bradfield, Jamaica Plain, Mass.	2 00
502	B. Pinkney, Philadelphia.	1 00
554	James J. Cornell, Perrville N. Y.	2 00
532	S. S. Hicks, Washington Hollow N. Y.	1 25
520	Isaac Hones, Pleasant Valley N. Y.	1 00
552	T. Jones, Cleveland O.	1 00
553	C. J. Hoag, Smithboro Vt.	2 00
556	Elizabeth B. Chase, Valley Falls R. I.	2 00
550	L. Gibbs, Greenwich N. Y.	1 00
540	Samuel Fogg, Quaker Springs N. Y.	1 00
493	Mrs. Maria Bateman, Worcester Mass.,	1 00
560	Daniel Clapp, Gardner Mass.	1 00
559	D. W. Cole, Fairfield N. Y.	1 00
540	John Baldly, Marlboro, N. Y.	1 40
573	Thomas McClintock, Waterloo, N. Y.	1 00
546	A. Palmer, "	2 00
564	Joseph Congdon, New Bedford, Mass.	2 00
560	Samuel Woodruff, Smithville, N. Y.	1 00
587	O. B. Fisher, East Hamburg, N. Y.	1 00
560	Nicholas Prosser, Hopedale, Mass	1 00
578	C. Donaldson, Cincinatti, O.	1 00
573	F. Donaldson, Swansea, England,	2 25
541	Ellis Sleeum, Kings Ferry, N. Y.	2 00
573	Eliza Thrasher, Hingham, Mass.,	1 00
590	Elizabeth Dunlap, "	1 00
590	Mary Tidmarsh, "	$100 00
581	Lydia Andrews, "	2 00
590	Rhoda Beal, "	2 00
521	Rev. Geo. N. Rice, Eastport, Me	2 00
542	L. B. Cowles, Austinburgh, O.	3 00
542	L. B. Fairbanks, Salem, "	1 00
572	A. C. Mary, Hudson, N. Y.	1 00
		$69 71

DONATIONS.

E. M. Davis, (pledge)	$100 00
Henry Grew, (pledge)	20 00

MARRIAGES.

Austin—May.—At the Hollow, by his Honor the Mayor, William B. Austin, of Boston, to Lydia H., daughter of Josiah Murcy.

Frost—Goodell.—At Hopeye, Ontario County, N. Y., by Rev. William Goodell, Mr. Lewis P. Frost, Minister of the Gospel at Aquila, Illinois, to Miss Maria C. Goodell, daughter of Rev. William Goodell, of Hopeye.

Bryant—Bellows.—At Bridgeport, Conn, Oct. 31, by the Rev. H. W. Bellows, of New York city, Rev. John A. Buckingham, of Cambridge, Mass, to Bergaan A., daughter of Rev. J. Nichols, Esq., of Savannah, Ga.

Dodge—Gay.—In Philadelphia, Oct. 29, Stephen G. Dobbin, of Boston, to Amelia D., daughter of Samuel Grant, of P.

Drake—Hosmer.—At Hopeye, Ontario County, N. Y., by Rev. William Goodell, Mr. Lewis P. Frost, Minister of the Gospel at Aquila, Illinois, to Miss Maria C. Goodell, daughter of Rev. William Goodell, of Hopeye.

Bryant—Bellows.—At Bridgeport, Conn, Oct. 31, by the Rev. H. W. Bellows, of New York city, Rev. John A. Buckingham, of Cambridge, Mass, to Bergaan A., daughter of Rev. J. Nichols, Esq., of Savannah, Ga.

Dodge—Gay.—In Philadelphia, Oct. 29, Stephen G. Dobbin, of Boston, to Amelia D., daughter of Samuel Grant, of P.

Drake—Hosmer.—At Philadelphia, on the 31st ult., by a Friends' ceremony, in the presence of Charles Gilpin, Mayor, Rowland W. Diller, of Springfield, Illinois, to Esther C., daughter of the late Joseph Ridgway, of that city.

Brown—Lockwood.—In Hart ord Ct., October 21, Lucius F. Robinson, Esq., to Elian Storrs, only daughter of Gov. Trumbull.

DEATHS.

Salisbury—At Weymouth, Mass., 20th inst., Wm. Salisbury, a graduate of Harvard University in the class of 1793, and Pastor of a Church in Jefferson, N. J., aged 75.

Butler.—At Little Rock, Ark., Dr. Wm. Butler, Cherokee Agent, and formerly member of Congress from S. Carolina.

Simpson.—In Grahamville, S. C., 21st ult., R. W. Singelton, Esq., member elect to the House of Representatives.

Dodge.—On board steamer City of Toronto, on the passage from Kingston to Toronto, P. M. Dodge, M. D. deceased had not recently arrived in America.

Martin.—At the Union Place Hotel, in the city, on Friday, the authoress, Mrs. Bell Martin, of Ireland. The deceased had not recently arrived in America, which she intended to traverse for the purpose of procuring materials for a book. On the voyage hither she suffered a miscarriage.

Graves.—At Bristol, R. I., on Sunday last, Rev. H. Graves, formerly of the Methodist Episcopal Church, aged 87.

Loring.—In Boston, Oct. 31, Caleb Loring, Esq., 86.

Parsa.—In Burlington, Vt. Oct. 30, Mrs. Sylvia A., wife of Rev. Hervey I. Parker, of Burlington, and youngest daughter of the late Philip Ammidon, Esq., of Boston, 35.

RECEPTION MEETING.

On Friday evening next, Nov. 15th, a public meeting will be held in this city—probably in FANEUIL HALL —by the friends of Liberty, Peace, Philanthropy, Reform, and Progress, to welcome the arrival among us of GEORGE THOMPSON, Esq., M. P., on a temporary visit to this country, and to express him their warm appreciation of his indefatigable and powerful labors for the abolition of chattel Slavery throughout the world—the moral elevation and political enfranchisement of the enslaving classes, and the entire protection of the nations of India from British injustice and oppression—and the promotion of the cause of human brotherhood universally. Addresses may be expected, on the occasion, from Wendell Phillips, Frederick Douglass, Wm. Lloyd Garrison, and others, and a large number of Distinguished Strangers, in Faneuil Hall is, it will be much too small to contain the thousands who are impatiently waiting for an opportunity to see and hear this untiring philanthropist and distinguished orator; and by their enthusiastic reception, to indicate their sense of the great and lasting change wrought in public sentiment since his sojourn here during the memorable period of 1834-5. The meeting can hardly fail to be one of the most thrilling interest, or to amply repay attendance from any and every part of New England.

It was desirable that a more prompt reception of Mr. Thompson should have been given: but in consequence of the pending State election, and in order to avoid even the appearance of seeking to influence parties in respect to it, it has been deemed judicious to defer the meeting until the election shall have fully transpired.

ANTI-SLAVERY BAZAAR.

The Committee beg leave to present a few additional statements in the consideration of such friends as have hitherto assisted us by furnishing table from their respective towns.

We confidently trust that all such will continue their efforts, taking no discouragement from the circumstance that the Boston Bazaar, which we hope will not have found a market at the Boston Bazaar. Their sale at various country Fairs has produced an equal amount of good to the Cause. Nor are we convinced of anything more fully than that the number of sales at any Bazaar is in exact proportion to the number and ability of the assisting Ladies. We are careful to mention this, because the donations of our Trans-Atlantic friends have been so generous as to create an impression, in some minds, that it may be wise to diminish our own labors, particularly in those departments of Embroidery and Fancy Fancy Work in which our contributors of Great Britain so highly excel. This opinion is erroneous. All donations of this kind are as needed and saleable as ever. Useful articles of every kind are desirable, and we hope that friends from the towns may furnish larger supplies of Stockings, Mittens, etc., than heretofore, as we have never been able in this respect to meet the demand.

Any donations of materials, such

Poetry.

THE RUNAWAY SLAVE AT PILGRIM'S POINT.

BY ELIZABETH BARRETT BROWNING.

I.

I STAND on the mark, beside the shore,
Of the first white pilgrims who landed knee;
Where exile changed to ancestor,
And God was thanked for liberty.
I have run through the night—my skin is as dark—
I bend my knee down on this mark—
I look on the sky and the sea.

II.

O, pilgrim-souls, I speak to you:
I see you come out proud and slow
From the land of the spirits, pale as dew,
And round me and round me go.
O, pilgrims, I have gasped and run
All night long from the whips of one
Who, in your names, works sin and woe!

III.

And thus I thought that I would come
And kneel here where ye knelt before,
And feel your souls around me hum
In undertone to the ocean's roar;
And lift my black face, my black hand,
Here in your names, to curse this land
Ye blessed in Freedom's, heretofore.

IV.

I am black, I am black,
And yet God made me, they say:
But if He did so—smiling, back
He must have cast his work away
Under the feet of His white creatures,
With a look of scorn, that the dusky features
Might be trodden again to clay.

V.

And yet He has made dark things
To be glad and merry as light;
There's a little dark bird sits and sings,
There's a dark stream ripples out of sight;
And the dark frogs chant in the safe morass,
And the sweetest stars are the best one to pass
O'er the face of the darkest night.

VI.

But we who are dark, we are dark!
O God, we have no stars!
About our souls, in care and cark,
Our blackness shuts like prison-bars!
And crouch our souls in our black bodies,
And creep our souls out behind,
That never a soul can see us find,
By reaching through their prison-bars.

VII.

Howbeit God's sunshine and His frost
They make us hot, they make us cold,
As if we were not black and lost;
And the beasts and birds in wood and wold,
Do fear us and take us for very prey
Could the whippoorwill or the cat of the glen
Look into my eyes and be bold?

VIII.

I am black, I am black,
And once I laughed in girlish glee;
For one of my color stood in the track
Where the drivers' drove, and looked at me:
And tender and full was the look he gave!
Slave looked at slave this one time—
I look at the sky and the sea.

IX.

And from that hour our spirits grew
As free as if unsold, unbought;
We were strong enough, since we were two,
To conquer the world, we thought.
The drivers drove us day by day;
We did not mind; we were one to one,
And so better a liberty sought.

X.

In the open ground, between the canes,
He said "I love you," as he passed:
When the shingle-roof rang sharp with the rains,
I heard how he vowed it fast.
While others trembled, he sate in the hut
And carved me a bowl of the cocoa-nut,
Through the roar of the hurricanes.

XI.

I sang his name instead of a song;
Over and over I sang his name:
Backward and forward I sang it along,
With my sweetest notes, it was still the same!
But I sang it low, that the slave-girls near
Might never guess, from what they could hear,
That all the song was a name.

XII.

I look on the sky and the sea!
We were two to love, and two to pray—
Two, yes, O God, who cried on Thee,
Though nothing didst thou say.
Coldly thou sat'st behind the sun,
And now I cry, who am but one—
Thou wilt not speak to-day!

XIII.

We were black, we were black,
We had no claim to love and bliss—
What marvel, ours was cast to wrack!
They wrung my cold hands out of his—
They dragged him—why, I crawled to touch
His blood's-mark in the dock's notched groove,
Ye pilgrim-souls—though plain as THIS!

XIV.

Wrong, followed by a greater wrong!
Grief seemed too good for such as I;
So the white men brought the shame ere long
To stifle the sob in my throat thereby.
They would not leave me for my dull
Wet eyes!—it was too much for them
To let me weep pure tears, and die.

XV.

I am black, I am black!
I wore a child upon my breast—
An amulet that hung too slack,
And, in my unrest, could not rest!
Thus we roamed along, child and mother,
One to another, one to another,
Until all ended for the best.

XVI.

For hark! I will tell you how—
I am black, you see;
And the babe, that lay on my bosom so,
Was far too white—too white for me.
As we sate in the ladies who scorned to pray
Beside me at church but yesterday,
Though my tears had washed a place for my knee.

XVII.

And my own child—I could not bear
To look in his face, it was so white;
So I covered him up with a kerchief rare,
I covered his face, in close and tight!
And he moaned and struggled as well as might be,
For the white child wanted his liberty—
Ha, ha! he wanted his master's right.

XVIII.

He moaned and beat with his hand and feet—
His little foot that never grew!
He stuck them out as it was meet
Against my heart to break it through.
I might have sung like a mother mild,
But I dared not sing to the white-faced child
The only song I knew.

XIX.

And yet I pulled the kerchief close;
He could not see the sun, I swear,
More then, alive, than now he does
From between the roots of the mangles—where?

I know where!—close!—a child and mother
Do wrong to look at one another,
When one is black and one is fair.

XX.

Even in that single glance I had
Of my child's face—I tell you all—
I saw a look that was not mad,
The master's look, that used to fall
On my soul like his lash—or worse—
Therefore, to save it from my curse,
I twisted it round in my shawl.

XXI.

And he moaned and trembled from foot to foot—
He shivered from head to foot—
Till, after a time, he lay, groaning,
Too suddenly still and mute.
And I felt, beside, a creeping cold—
I dared to lift up just a fold,
As in lifting a leaf of the mango fruit.

XXII.

But MY fruit! ha, ha!—there had been
(I laugh to think on't at this hour!)
Your fine white angels—who have seen
Your faces nearest to His power—
And gathered my fruit to make them wine,
And sucked the soul of that child of mine,
As the humming-bird sucks the soul of the flower.

XXIII.

Ha, ha! for the trick of the angels white!
They freed the white child's spirit so;
I sold not a word, but day and night
I nursed its body to and fro;
And is lay on my heart like a stone—as chill;
The sun may shine out much as he will—
I am cold, though it happened a month ago.

XXIV.

From the white man's house and the black man's hut
I carried the little body on;
The forest's arms did around us shut,
And silence through the trees did run!
They asked no questions as I went—
They stood too high for astonishment—
They could see God rise on his throne.

XXV.

My little body, kerchiefed fast,
I bore it on through the forest—on—
And when I felt it was tired at last,
I scooped a hole beneath the moon.
Through the forest-tops the angels far,
With a whole God-power, looked down on me
Did point and mock at what was done.

XXVI.

Yet when it all was done aright,
Earth twixt me and my baby strewed—
All changed to black earth—nothing white—
A dark child in the dark—ensued
Some comfort, and my heart grew young;
I sate down smiling there, and sung
The song I told you of, for good.

XVIII.

And thus we two were reconciled,
The white child and black mother, thus;
For, as I sang it—soft and wild,
The same song, more melodious,
Rose from the grave whereon I sate!
It was the dead child singing that,
To join the souls of both of us.

XXVIII.

I look on the sea and the sky!
Where the Pilgrims' ships first anchored lay,
To great sun rises glorifying!
But the Pilgrims' ghosts have slid away
Through the first faint streaks of the morn!
My face is black, but it glares with a scorn
Which they dare not meet by day

XXIX.

Ah, in their stead their hunter-sons!
Ah, ah! they are on me! they form in a ring!
Keep off—I brave you all at once—
I draw off your eyes like a welcome thing!
You have killed the black eagle at nest, I think;
Did you never stand still in your triumph, and shrink
From the stroke of her wounded wing?

XXX.

(Man, drop that stone you dared to lift!—)
I wish you, who stand there, seven abreast,
Each for his own wife's grace and gift,
A little corpse as safely at rest,
Hid in the mangles! yes, but *she*
May keep live babies on her knee,
And sing the song she liketh best.

XXXI.

I am not mad—I am black!
I see you staring in my face—
I know you staring, shrinking back—
Ye are born of the Washington race!
And this hand is the Free America—
And this mark on my wrist—(I prove what I say)
Ropes tied me apart to the flogging-place.

XXXII.

Our wounds are different—your white men
Are, after all, not gods indeed,
Nor able to make Christs again
Do good with healing! Ye who bleed—
(Stand off!)—we help not in our loss—
We are too heavy for our cross,
And fall and crush you and your seed.

XXXIII.

I fall—I SWOON—I look at the sky!
The clouds are breaking on my brain:
I am dented along, as if I should die
Of Liberty's exquisite pain!
In the space of the world I stand waiting for me
In the deep black death where our kisses agree—
White men, I leave you all curse-free,
In my broken heart's disdain!

—*Liberty Bell.*

AN ANGEL IN THE HOUSE.

BY LEIGH HUNT.

How sweet it were, if without feele fright,
One day of the doubtful beautifone sight,
An angel came to us and we could bear
To see him leane from the silent air
At evening in our room, and bend on ours
His divine eyes, and bring us from his bowers
News of dear friends, and children who have never
Been dead indeed—as we shall know forever.
Alas! We think not what we daily see
About our hearts—angels that are to be,
Or may be if they will, and we prepare
Their souls and ours to meet in happy air—
A child, a friend, a wife whose soft heart sings
In unison with ours, breeding its future wings.

Miscellany.

EBENEZER ELLIOTT.

WE copy from the *London Inquirer* this sketch of the life of the Corn-Law Rhymer, and review of his literary works.

Many readers will be disappointed to find that a man of so much experience as Ebenezer Elliott has left behind him only a short Autobiography consisting of twenty-five pages of his life, and filling about as many pages of the work before us. Although urged by many friends to write a history of his life so full of struggling, first, for bread, and the events which he could record were not sufficiently remarkable; and next that the retrospection of many years of struggle and misfortune would involve details too painful for his mind voluntarily to dwell upon. In his own forcible style, Elliott declared, "I am not yet prepared, not yet sufficiently petrified in heart and brain by time and trouble, to tell a tale, in telling which I must necessarily live over again months and years of living death." The task, however, which he shrunk from himself, he at length bequeathed to another; he had thought of engaging his son Francis as his biographer, but altered his mind before he died that a second pen might be more impartial. We regret the determination: his own son might, with the assistance of early friends, have given the world a history of this patient, mind struggling onward through seasons of difficulty, and finding through his own awakened taste and love of the beautiful in nature and the good in man, and his trust in God, solace and assuagement even in his darkest days. He might have given us also—what we miss in his *biography of his poems*, indicating the progress of his taste and the influence of events, and told us more of the influence which he exercised over the minds of others. Mr. Watkins only became acquainted with Elliott eleven years before his death; he resided at a great distance from him; and he has infused into the work far too much of literary criticism.

The book is dedicated to Sir Robert Peel, a fascimile of the letter being prefixed in which he granted Mr. Watkins the Royal permission. Elliott had said some very rough things about Sir Robert—even this volume is not free from such aspersions—but since the hero became a free-trader, he might have smiled at sallies directed against the old garments which he had cast aside.

Ebenezer Elliott was born at Rotherham, in the year 1781, at the "New Foundry," where his father had a salary of sixty or seventy pounds a-year, with house, candles, and coal. There the father, a man of great "natural and humorous powers, and of uncommon political sagacity, used to preach every fourth Sunday to persons who came from distances of twelve and fourteen miles to hear his tremendous doctrines of ultra-Calvinism (he called himself a Berean), and hell hung round with span-long children!" On other days, pouring to the aque ini pictures on the walls, he delighted to dwell on the virtues of slandered Cromwell and of Washington the rebel; or shaking his sides with laughter, explained the glories of "the glorious victory of his Majesty's forces over the rebels at Bunker's Hill!" "Here," says Elliott, "the reader has a key which will unlock all my future politics. I never then was the a man who knew not fear, that man was the father of the Corn-law Rhymer!"

But this rough man had a feeble helpmate: from his mother's infirmities, Elliott thought that he had "derived nervous irritability, bashful awkwardness, a miserable power to attempt, and a fatal one, evil." In his sixth year he became frightfully disfigured by the small-pox. So far, there was nothing promising in Ebenezer's childhood,—but even at eight years old he had some taste for the beautiful, and loved to see the sun and clouds reflected in a pan of water, though he had *been beaten for this horrible*,—that taste which developed itself in some of his earlier poetry. When a child he excelled in handicraft, but he tells us that his imitative talents were in no respect,—he was a dunce at home:—"Having got into the rule-of-three, without having first learnt the preliminary rules," Elliott was thought stupid at school, and consequently, disliked to attend it. His father set him to work in the foundry as a punishment:—

"But," he says, "working in the foundry, so far from being a punishment, it was a relief me from the sense of inferiority which had so long depressed me, for I was not fitted to be less clever than other beginners. The result of his experiment vexed the experimenter, and he had good cause for vexation; for it soon appeared that I could play upon the York-Kentish with the best of its customers. Yet I never thoroughly relished the rude company and coarse enjoyments of the alehouse. My thoughts consequently wandered in the canal-banks and my little ships; and I always built my fortresses, eye, sun, and castles in the air, too, where the flowers were the finest."

Flowers were to Elliott good angels. His awakening mind, which would inevitably have become rapidly debased had he continued his evil habits, was,—

"Healed and harmonis'd
By the benignant touch of love and beauty."

He was on his way to the Methodist Chapel, one Sunday, when he called on his Aunt Robinson, a widow who, with only £30 a year, gave her two sons a good education:—

"I thought," he says, "she received me coldly. She did not, I think, know that I had been tipsy a night or two before, but I was conscience-stricken. After a minute's silence, she rose, and laid before me a number of Sowerby's 'English Botany,' which her son Benjamin was purchasing monthly. Never shall I forget the impression made on me by the beautiful plates. I actually touched the figure of the primrose, half convinced that the moment the leaves were seized, I should find when she removed the book from me—but she removed it only to show me how to draw the figures, by holding them to the light, and to place a little piece of paper before them. On finding that I could so draw them correctly, I was lifted at once above the inmates of the alehouse at least in food intellectual pleasures. Remembering, when I happened to have a spare hour, I went to my aunt's to draw."

A book of dried plants was "the next revealed marvel." Ebenezer now delighted to wander in search of flowers, and had soon a "*Hortus Siccus*" of his own. He was quite familiar with a "beautiful green snake, about a yard long," which seemed to expect him at the top of a lane on the fine Sabbath mornings. "I knew not how often this beautiful and harmless child of God may have sued for his picture in my writings—a dozen, at least." About this time, Ebenezer heard his brother Giles, "a clever, handsome youth, who was "a capital reader," read the first book of Thomson's "Seasons."

"When he came to the description of the Polyanthus and Auricula, I waited impatiently till he laid down the book; I then took it into the garden, where I compared the description with the living flowers. Here was another new idea—botany in verse!—a prophecy that the days of scribbling were at hand. But my earliest taste in poetry was like that of Birbeck the weaver, who of all things liked best 'a scene to tear a cat in.'"

In after-life, Elliott dated the commencement of his poetic taste to "Sowerby's Botany," and said that, without that impulse, he might have been a drunkard. Yet he did not pursue what is called "the science of Botany," the classifications were too much like letters for his poetic delight in.

And now he sought to mend his own imperfect education, he strove with much pains to master English grammar, and read poetry, which fortunately bequeathed to his father by a poor crate. Among these were "Barrow's Sermons" (of which he was never weary), "Young's Night Thoughts," some travels, views of countries, and fine colored plates of foreign birds. "Then followed Milton, who held me fast for ever."

The first of Elliott's poems is entitled "The Vernal Walk," it was written in his seventeenth year, inscribed to Miss Sarah Austin as "a Man in Council," and was first printed at Cambridge, by Benjamin Flower, whom Elliott terms "the father of the liberal newspaper press—a man great in his goodness." While this lay long unknown in his mind from the highest models, Elliott, from his sixteenth to his twenty-third year, worked for his father as labriously as any "serf-born" he had, and without wages, except an occasional shilling or two for pocket-money, weighing, every morning, all the unfinished castings as they were made, &c.

Although Elliott's early poems did not receive much approbation even from the critics in his domestic circle, his attempts were very various. He tried dramatic poetry, but failed, like many other able writers, in that difficult walk. Looking back upon his own works, he denied to himself the praise of genius. "Time," he says, "has developed me not genius, but power, which exist in all men, and life dormant in most."

Not so, thought Laureate Southey, a candid and kindly critic, when not warped by political animosity, who reviewed Elliott's works after the appearance of the celebrated "Corn-law Rhymes" had made him obnoxious to a large party in the country, and who, while he severely deprecated his political views, yet hailed him as a poetic spirit. "When he writes his best," said Southey, "indeed there are none who could write better; and when he is possessed by Radicalism, God forbid that there should be such a man!" "Why, he is a spirit, should write so well!" He accounted for the scanty sale of the earlier poems by the fact of their being written in "the Sheffield dialect, and in the art of poetry—"They are the work of a learner, of an aspirant. They contain abundant proofs of genius, but the best of them are composed of heterogeneous materials." They were also "carried to a market overstocked with poetry." This critique, which Southey prepared for the "Quarterly Review," and which he had even corrected a proof for the press, was rejected by the editor of that periodical, to whose despotic hat the Laureate invariably bowed without murmuring; it is included in the second volume of "More Verse and Prose, by the Corn-law Rhymer." Elliott's last publication.

When Elliott had attained the age, "his father's affairs, which involved his own, went wrong." At the age of forty, he had to begin the world anew. He left Rotherham, and commenced in Sheffield, with a borrowed capital of £100. He dealt in the raw material of Sheffield cutlery, and by prudence and industry he succeeded so far as to extend his business in 1840, with about £6,000, after having first enabled his six sons to "quit the nest." Soon after settling in Sheffield, Elliott became aware of the necessity of the repeal of the Corn-laws. The subject took possession of his ardent mind, and he gave utterance to his thoughts with all the fervor of a poet, he could command. In the preface to his last work, Elliott says—"I claim to have been a pioneer of the greatest, the most beneficial, the only great moral revolution which I can have seen.—

When I became Free-trade agitator in 1824, I could no find one respectable shopkeeper who thought the Corn-laws an evil! But the evil was before the eyes of Elliott, sleeping or waking, and with all his soul he strove against it. Read, as a specimen, his stanzas from one of the later published "Hymns":—

"The child that valarly toils to aid
Parents, death-doom'd by fettered trade;
The sire who toiling cries,
Lives but to be undone;
The twenty-year-old wretch has and less:
The homeless thrall of hopelessness;
The peasant, spurn'd, starv'd, hunted, jail'd,
Because his sire made down-pillow of his bed
Still shall they feed with pangs the Moloch of the land,
That engine o'er crushed hearts may drive his four-in-hand?"

Such were the strains which Elliott put forth under the inspiration of the Spirit of Truth. Such the His rough and indignant eloquence sometimes outraged propriety; it was with truth that, as he said with true feeling,—

"Distempered if not mad,
I feed on Nature's bone, and mess with scorn.
I would not, could not if I would, be glad,
But, like sheltering pigeons, I am happiest sad."

But we cannot agree, by any means, with his biographer in crying "pity that he could not have always breathed the mountain breezes—yea, have been the Zephyr itself." No, indeed; to show off the restraints of monopoly was no Zephyr's task—it was a rough and hard, but an honorable task, and he did Sheffield's best service in giving it to it, and rightly does he deserve a fitting monument in that town where he so long and earnestly labored, and of which he was the idol:—

"Ere Bedford's leaf or Erin's ivy be thine,
Cloud-rolling Sheffield! want shall humble all.
Yea, at your hearths, your sons shall not pine
Like the fell-nurtin, licensed Rapine's thrall;
But first to rise, will be the first to fall!
Slow are thy sons the pauper's trade to learn."

Village Patriarch.

We must also give our readers what Elliott declared to be "not an overcharged picture of the condition of some of his mechanics" in Sheffield. "A home of taste," says Elliott, "is within the reach of thousands of them!"—

THE HOME OF TASTE.

"You seek the home of taste, and find
The proud mechanic there,
Rich as a king, and less a slave,
Thrust forward on the world's light!
Or on his sofa, reading Locke,
Beside his mantel, clock,
Why start?—why every worth like his,
The carpet on his floor?

"You seek the home of slutternessy—
'Is John at home?' you ask.
'No, sir; he's at the sign of "Sportsman's Arm,"
'The dog fight's o'er the way.'
O lift the latch, and lift your mind
Above low sensual sin!
Give him a home in the home of taste!
Outbid the house of gin!

"O give him taste! lt is the link
Which binds us to the skies—
A bridge of rainbows, thrown across
The gulf of tears and sighs;
Or like a widower's little one—
An angel child—
That leads him to her mother's chair,
And shows him how she smiles!"

Elliott's "Miscellaneous Poems."

We would rather quote from Elliott than from his biographer, but Mr. Watkins has written one interesting and instructive chapter. He says:—

"The attentive reader of this Autobiography will perceive that Ebenezer Elliott was born with the fatal gift of a poetic temperament, which was to be deployed in the present social system as the brand on the forehead of Cain."

The "attentive reader" will will go through all Mr. Watkin's part of this work will find that he himself makes a counter-statement at p. 193. The general strain of Elliott's life and writings tended to prove how surprisingly and how deeply the character improves the happiness of man. In a lecture which he delivered at the Sheffield Mechanics' Institution, "On Cowardice and Duty," Elliott said:—

"Perhaps no falsehood has been oftener repeated, than that men of genius are less fortunate and less virtuous than other men: but the obvious truth, that they who attempt little are less liable to suffer than they who attempt much, will account for the proverbial good luck of fools. In our estimate of the sorrows and failings of literary man, we forget that sorrow is the common lot; we forget, too, that the misfortunes and the errors of great men, have been recorded, and that minutest faults will be sure to find zealous historians."

In another lecture, delivered at the same Institution, Elliott thus feelingly expressed himself:—

"We could not be one of the Legion of Immortals, though frail as the flower of the field, yet eternal in their usefulness? Shakspeare or Milton of this year of grace 1841? What, shall we be sure that these vast reputations are no longer possible? And what though it may be true that the soldiers of the Legion of Good Works will be so numerous, and so unlike each other? Their consequences cannot be trodden down, they cannot be sold, they cannot be lost, but not their results, if indeed ye are Shakespeares and Miltons."

"Look ahead on life—use it and serve it," was one of Elliott's characteristic admonitions to a young literary friend.

Mr. Watkins describes the house at Upperthorpe, near Sheffield, where Elliott resided while engaged in business:—

"A neat stone building standing on an eminence in the midst of a large garden. On the mantle-piece of his best-parlor stood a small full-length bust of Scott, and an extract from Channing, "On the Resemblance of Genius," written in his own bold hand and framed. A few books lay on the table—Sowerby's Botany, which, he said, first made him a poet."

On leaving business, Elliott withdrew into the country, and built himself a cottage at great Houghton, near Barnsley; where he appears to have been rather too much out of society, too much among mountains and solitudes to enjoy the complete satisfaction; but he was declining in health, and saddened by disease supposed to be incurable. He enjoyed his leisure, however, and thought the last month of his life, and his mental vigor remained unimpaired even to the last. At his wish, the marriage of his daughter was hastened, that it might take place before his death. On the 17th of December, 1849, Elliott caused himself to be lifted out of bed, and placed at the window to see the family group depart for the church where the ceremony was performed, and requested them to come to him for his blessing on their return. When they gathered round his bed-side he said, "This is Roger's Human Life!" He planned several excursions for the month of May which he was to enjoy with his family.

During this last fortnight of life, "the trees were weeping their leaves for the poet of Nature, and his favorite little bird, the Robin, perched beneath his window, and trilled its pensive lay. He heard it, and dictated the very last verses which he wrote:

"Thy notes, sweet Robin, soft as dew,
Heard soon or late, are dear to me;
To music I would bid adieu,
But not to thee.

"When from my eyes earth's lateful throng
Has passed away, no more to be,
Then, Autumn's primrose, Robin's song,
Return to me."

This song was sung to him by his daughter, like the music of the dying swan" He died on the first of December, and was buried, by his own direction, where his daughter was married.

Elliott was a decided reformer, but not a socialist; he held that "competition is the law of God, unerring as that which governs the earth round its axis." The right to vote for members of parliament he thought should be "founded on property and knowledge," that property and knowledge should be the qualifications for person possesses. "No boy is born possessed of a right to cut his own fingers, and before any person meddles with mine, I would have him understand the edge-tools."

A SCHOOL EXERCISE

OF THE EIGHTH CENTURY.

In a recent article, we collected for the entertainment of our young friends, out of Guizot's lectures, some of the holy legends which formed the delight and diet of the refined and educated in the fifth and sixth centuries. From the same author we will now give them a specimen of the school exercises, as dispensed in the palace of Charlemagne, between the years 782 and 796, to a select class consisting of the young courtiers and relatives of that monarch, who was usually himself present at the exercises. This school, called the School of the Palace, was superintended by a learned philosopher, named Alcuin, who was born at the city of York, in England, about the year 735, and being sent on a mission to Rome in 780, he met Charlemagne in Parma. The emperor at once pressed him to take up his abode in France, to attend his court, and presiding over the School of the Palace, he and his pupils always accompanied the emperor in his journeys. M. Guizot says, "I suppose that the instructions were conveyed principally in conversation, and among others Alcuin had for his auditors, Charles, Pepin, and Louis, the sons of Charlemagne, Gisla his daughter and his sister of the same name. Anglibert and Adalhard his privy-counsellors, with Guinrade the sister of Adalhard, and Richtrade a nun of Chelles, conversing with of these exercises have come down to the present day, which thought puerile when considered as means of education, deserves attention as an evidence of the eager curiosity with which the mind, in its crude infancy, ranges over the greatest variety of subjects, and delights to take in odd combinations and ingenious fancies. It is a conversation between Alcuin and Pepin, Charlemagne's second son, at that period a youth of fifteen or sixteen; parts of it here follow:—

Pepin. What is writing?
Alcuin. The keeper of history.
P. What is speaking?
A. The interpreter of the soul.
P. What is it gives birth to speaking?
A. The tongue.
P. What is the tongue?
A. The whip of air.
P. What is life?
A. Happiness for the happy; misery for the miserable; the expectation of death.
P. What is death?
A. An inevitable event: a doubtful journey; a subject of tears for the living; a confirmation of wills; a robber of the living.
P. What is man?
A. The slave of death, a passing traveller, a guest in his own house.
P. How is man placed?
A. As a traveller exposed to the world.
P. Where is he placed?
A. Between six walls.
P. What are they?
A. The four winds.
P. What is that below, that on the right, that on the left, that in front, that behind?
P. What is the body?
A. The abode of the soul.
P. What is light?
A. The torch of all things.
P. What is the sun?
A. The splendor of the universe, the beauty of the firmament, the grace of nature, the glory of the day, the distributor of the hours.
P. What is night?
A. The mother of all that grows, the nurse of all that exists, the granary of life, the gulf which swallows up all things.
P. What is winter?
A. The exile of spring.
P. What is spring?
A. The painter of the earth.
P. What is summer?
A. The power which clothes the earth, and ripens fruits.
P. What is autumn?
A. The granary of the year.
P. What is the year?
A. The chariot of the world.
P. What is a ship?
A. A ship is a wandering house, an inn ready in all places, a traveller who leaves no trace behind him.
P. What is it renders bitter things sweet.
A. Hunger.
P. What is it of which men never grow weary?
A. Gain.
P. What is marvellous?
A. I saw the other day a man standing, a dead man walking, a man walking who had never breathed.
P. How may that have been? Explain yourself.
A. It was an image reflected in the water.
P. How could I have failed to understand you? I who have so often seen the same thing.
A. As you are a youth of good disposition, and endowed with natural capacity, I will put to you several other unusual questions; endeavor to solve them.
P. I will do my best, if I make mistakes, you must correct them.
A. Doubtless. Some one who is unknown to me has conversed with me, having no tongue, and no voice; I saw him, and he was not heard; I heard him, and I neither heard or knew him. What means this?
A. Perhaps you mean a dream, master.
A. Exactly so, my son. Listen once more: I have seen the dead engender the living, and the living engender by the breath of the living.
P. Fire was produced by rubbing together dead branches, and it then consumed the branches.
A. You are quite accurate. L. G.

(The Child's Friend.

THE GENUINE PRIZE SONG FOR JENNY LIND.

(At the service of Mr Barnum.)

I AM glad I have born from my own northern home,
Far away o'er the wide rolling sea,
Where I stand on the glorious land,
Where alone dwelleth a people free!
Never here for vile gold human beings are sold,
Who the tint of our brotherhood wear;
If that token they lack—If the wretches are black—
Oh, why then that's another affair!

La, la, la!
Yes—of course that's another affair!

Every man of each sect holds his head up, erect
As the eagle that flows the sun;
Ah! you do not see here class o'er class domineer,
Here are all equal—no nobles—no none.
In this nation sublime, wretches branded with crime
Rise alone in base threldom their sin;
And the sons of the soil blight and wither and eve
For the deepest, is darkness of skin!

La, la, la!
Yes—the worst guilt is darkness of skin!

Here a fond wedded pair independently share
All the joys of the conjugal life,
There is no law to part heart united to heart,
Wife from husband, and husband from wife.
Such barbarity fell, as the observed fell
From the parent is wholly unknown;
But their lips if too full, and their hair curly wool,
Should have no child nor wife of their own!

La, la, la!
No, they have no child nor wife of their own!

At the tyrant's proud hand there's no scourge to command
On this side the Atlantic's broad wave,
No American can by his own fellow-man
Be flogged by the stripes of the slave.
Man is sacred from blows—by the right of his nose,
If it be not too broad and too flat:
Then you're licensed to thrash—then fall on with the lash—
He's only a nigger, and born to the cat!

La, la, la!
Yes, a nigger, and born to the cat!—[*Punch.*

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

—"On Sunday," says *Galignani*, "an aeronaut, which exceeded in boldness anything that has hitherto been attempted, took place from the Hippodrome, the *Uranus*, the balloon belonging to M. Poitevin, rose in the air, carrying, in addition to the aeronaut, three female passengers belonging to the theatre, who were suspended from the car. They had wings affixed to their shoulders, and appeared as if flying in the air. their ascent was hailed with shouts from the immense concourse of persons assembled, but a feeling of terror seemed to prevail when the female passengers descended in mid air, without anything apparent to support them. After being about an hour in the air, they alighted in safety on a field near Villejuif."

—A CORRESPONDENT of the *Birmingham Mercury* concludes that, should Kossuth visit England, he would be sure to stay, like Mr. Cobden, in such a case, he thinks, "it would be worthy the attention of those who are in the habit of getting up railway trips to try and engage simultaneous trips to Birmingham from all parts of the kingdom, for the purpose of seeing the 'foremost man of the time.' Supposing this to be the case, if Kossuth could be induced to address a few words to an English audience, *standing*, on the spot where that most delicate question of Hungarian and Austrian independence, the Austrian, under the power which this odious Bill gives to the slave-power.

Fortunately for humanity, Canada still is English, and the Canadian Parliament, and the citizens of Canadian frontier, will find, under the English flag, the protection from tyranny which the vaunted banner of the Stars and Stripes no longer afford him.—*London Weekly Times.*

—A BALLOON TRIP.—In a letter, dated Madrid, and inserted in *Le Pays*, we are told that a new elevated balloon, or rather aerial steam-ship, constructed by a M. J. Hontoria, left the Place de Toros, Madrid to Lon. on the 10th instant. It is enabled (says the letter,) to sail *against* contrary winds, by the aid of a propeller, worked by the air alternately, and fashioned almost like the wings of a bird. In the forepart of the balloon, corresponding to the prow of a ship, a fixed sail is spread, which, when it is shorten, by means of internal machinery, a considerable quantity of air, which, being let off by a second funnel placed at the stern of the balloon, produces a very considerable power. This vast mass is calculated to attain a speed of 150 miles an hour in calm weather. Its appearance is that of a powerful steam Frigate, with sails and steam! We have not yet heard of its *arrival*. The *Boulogne Gazette* of Thursday last, says that there for a supply of gas! The *Gazette* had also heard that a party in Paris, indignant at the idea of the Spaniards claiming the invention of steering balloons, had also mounted into the upper regions, determined to be in London before them.

—Dr. Bowring.—Dr. Bowring's numerous friends in Europe will be glad to learn that the health of this gentleman, during the last month has considerably improved. We have heard that the learned Dr. learned doctor when saying, that we think Lord Palmerston was well satisfied in choosing him as Mr. Macgregor's successor. There is a rumor about the sudden selection of consular officers for China. Mr. N'Cullch has a pensioned, and Dr. Bowring is dismissed, in order to be properly qualified for his employment, should take care to make himself master of the language used by the court of Pekin, and to be able to speak to the Chinese, with ease upon subjects relating to his duties." Now, it is next to an impossibility to master the Chinese language, in two years' residence, so far as to be talking up in the study of it detracts from other equally important avocations; whilst it is an astonishing fact, that the clear-headed Bowring, notwithstanding the difficulty is once begun, entirely unitures the mind for business of every life. Dr. Bowring, with a facility peculiarly his own, has however, in the short period of his stay here, so far mastered the colloquial, as to be able to keep up a conversation, conversing with Chinese officers, and enjoys, with this acquisition, advantages which the other consuls in China do not, we believe, possess. But the great qualification for a consular officer in China is a certain inquisitiveness, indicing him not to stop for things to come to him, or he brought round, but to go himself, and to satisfy—to go, in short, and seek for them. Without knowing the contents of Dr Bowring's diary, we will make bold to say that it will contain an amount of matter that will need remark as can only be conceived by those who have some China knowledge of his activity and genius.—*Morning Friend of China.*

—LOOKING THE REMAINS OF JAMES THE SECOND.—The following letter was given to me by Mr. Fitzsimons, an Irish gentleman, upwards of 80 years of age, with whom I became acquainted when resident with my family at Dublin, in September, 1848. He had been resided in that city for many years as a teacher of the French and English languages, and had attended the late Sir William Betham in the Record office there in 1817. He said:—"I was a prisoner in Paris, in the convent of the English Benedictines, in the Rue St. Jacques, during part of the revolution. In the year 1793 or 1794, the body of King James II, of England was in one of the chapels there, where it had been deposited some time, with the expectation that it would one day be sent to England for interment in Westminster Abbey, but it had been buried. The body was in a wooden coffin, enclosed in a leaden one, and that again enclosed in a second wooden one, covered with black velvet. Some of us, as prisoner the sans-culottes broke open the coffins to get at the lead to cast into bullets. The body lay exposed nearly a whole day. It was embalmed like a mummy, bound tight with gartets. The sans-culottes took out the body, which had been embalmed. There was a strong smell of vinegar and camphor. The complexion of the face was perfect; the hands and nails were very fine; I moved and bent every finger. I never saw so fine a set of teeth in my life. A young man, who was a prisoner, took a mind to have a tooth; I tried to get one out for her, but could not, they were so firmly fixed. The feet also were very beautiful. The lips and cheeks were just as if he were alive. I rolled his eyes; the eyeballs were perfectly firm without any decay. The English prisoners gave money to the sans-culottes for showing the body. They said he was a good sans-culotte, and followed with great pleasure the funeral to the public churchyard like other sans-culottes; and he was carried away, but where the body was thrown I never heard. I was very fond of my child all his life, to get sidings of the body, but could not. Around the chapel there several wax models of the face hung up, made, probably, from the mold of the face, and of the proper was very like them. The body had been originally kept at the palace of St. Germains, whence it was brought to the convent of the Benedictines, Mr. Porter, the prior, was a prisoner at the time in his own convent."—*Notes and Queries.*

—THE FOUNDER OF THE HOSPITAL FOR ERRING WOMEN.—St. Francis de Sales, of a noble family of Savoy, was born at Sonnay, in 1567. His mother, who had reared him with difficulty, and loved him with inexpressible tenderness, had early dedicated him in her heart to God; and the last words of her lips, that words he uttered distinctly were, "Dieu et ma mère n'aiment bien!" and to the last moment of his life, love, in its scriptural sense, and with all the tenderness of charity, was the element in which he existed. He was Bishop of Geneva from 1602 to 1622, and most worthily discharged all the duties of his office. He is celebrated for his devotional writings, which are almost as much admired by Protestants as by Catholics for their eloquence and Christian spirit; it is perhaps more interesting for his benign and tolerant character; his zeal, so tempered by gentleness, for the Church of Rome, and his famous as a controversialist, once said, "If you would have the heretics convinced, bring them to me: if you would have them converted, send them to the Bishop of Geneva." The distinction here drawn, and the feeling expressed, seem to me alike honorable to the speaker. By the same spirit, he was led to the work, St. Francis de Sales was blamed for two things especially. In the first place, he had, in his famous book, Introduction to a Devout Life, spoken of dancing as a recreation. Even his eulogists think it necessary to explain away this relaxation from rigid Christianity; and a fanatic friar of his diocese had the insolence, after preaching against him, to burn his book in the face of the assembled multitude, and to which he even remonstrate. The second subject of reproach against him was, his too great gentleness to sinners who came to him for absolution. He was accused of and deprived of these to his moral address in words of encouragement:—"All I ask of you is, not to despair!" To those who remonstrated against this act of mercy, he contented himself with replying, "Had Saul been rejected, what would we have had St Paul?" The good prelate died suddenly in 1622, and was canonised by Alexander VII. in 1665. Bossuet, Bourdinlous, and Fléchier, honored him in their eloquent funeral orations. Portraits and devotional prints and pictures of St. Francis de Sales were formerly very popular in France. In the galleries of Versailles, and in the Louvre, and in the churches of the Minimes, they were commonly met with. The Minimes have enrolled him in their own order, in consequence of his extreme veneration for their patriarch, St. Francis de Paula; but it is to be included in any order, I believe it should be that of the Augustines, as a regular canon or priest. He was so remarkable for the beauty of his person, and the angelic expression of his regular and delicate features, that painting could hardly idealise him. He is represented in the episcopal copy generally bare headed; and in prints he is represented as a bare-headed and crowned with thorns, and surmounted by a cross placed within a glory of light.—*Legends of the Monastic Order, by Mrs. Jameson.*